NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXVII.

DECEMBER, 1899.

THE HISTORICAL CAUSES OF THE PRESENT WAR IN SOUTH AFRICA.

BY THE RIGHT HON. JAMES BRYCE, M. P.

THE events which have led up to the present conflict in South Africa, which I am asked to sketch in outline for American readers, cannot well be understood without some little knowledge of the physical configuration of the country and the character of its people. It is a great, wild, dry, bare country, with an exceedingly small population of white men, and a population of blacks which is not large in comparison with its area. This area, taking South Africa to be the region which lies south of the Zambesi, is some 1,400,000 square miles, and within its limits there are much less than one million of white men, Dutch, English and Portuguese, with a handful of Germans—that is to say, less than the population of Philadelphia. Nearly one-half of that area is desert—by which I mean a practically waterless tract, no better for ranching or agriculture than the sagebrush deserts of Nevada. Of the rest, by far the larger part is much too dry for agriculture, but fit for sheep and cattle, resembling, roughly speaking, the ranching districts of western Nebraska or Wyoming. There are fertile valleys near the south and southeast coast, because the heat is there not so severe and the rainfall more abundant; but the interior is an elevated plain, where the strong sun rapidly dries up the

Copyright, 1899, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rains of the summer months, so that cultivation must, nearly everywhere, be carried on by means of irrigation. Now, there are very few places in South Africa where it pays to irrigate the soil; and, consequently, there is, except here and there toward the coast, a very small number of persons engaged in agriculture. Neither are there any forests worth mentioning, nor any manufactures, except small local industries in the few towns. Till very recently, the whole occupation of the country, and that wherein its wealth lay, was the rearing of sheep and cattle. It is an occupation which gives employment to very few persons in proportion to the surface over which flocks and herds feed; and this is why the population has grown so slowly during the last two centuries and a half.

For South Africa is by no means a new European colony, like Australia. It was discovered at the end of the fifteenth century by Bartholomew Diaz, six years before the discovery of America. The first European settlement was planted at Sofala, on the south-east coast, by the Portuguese in A. D. 1505, the next by the Dutch at Cape Town in 1652. The Portuguese, however, never succeeded in establishing any hold upon the interior, and the extreme unhealthiness of the region where their posts were placed blighted the growth of their settlements, which are to-day quite insignificant, and will probably some day pass into the hands of stronger Powers. Besides, their blood has become mixed with that of the natives to an extent which has caused the race to deteriorate.

The Dutch settlement advanced very slowly for many years. It was governed by a company whose aim was rather to make money by trade than to develop the country, and maladministration produced a discontent which had begun to reveal the bold and restless character of the settlers. When England captured the Cape during the great war against Napoleon (in 1806), there were only some twenty-seven thousand whites in the whole colony. After the war was over, and when England, which had in 1814 paid six millions, sterling, to the Dutch for the country, was firmly planted there, some English settlers began to come in, as others have done from time to time ever since. But the influx of these settlers has been less than the natural increase of the Dutch population, so that in Cape Colony the inhabitants of Dutch stock to-day outnumber those of English stock, and the Dutch language

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is (except in the towns) more generally spoken than is the English.

These two stocks have so much in common that it might have been expected that they would readily amalgamate, and at any rate would, as the Dutch and the English did long ago in New York, be on good terms with one another. They are akin in blood and in speech. They are both Protestant. In character and in habits, and, indeed, in appearance also, one may note many resemblances between the peasant of Holland and the peasant of East Anglia. If the English Government had been wise in its measures, if it had understood the country better and been careful to send out only sensible and sympathetic men as governors, the Dutch of South Africa, who had no attachment to Holland, might soon have become attached to England, and would at any rate have been, though they are naturally of an independent spirit, quiet and peaceable subjects. England, however, managed things ill. She altered the system of courts and local government, reducing the rights which the people had enjoyed. She insisted on the use of the English language to the exclusion of Dutch. In undertaking to protect the natives and the slaves, whom the Dutch were accused by the English missionaries of treating very harshly, she did what was right, but the farmers complained that the missionaries sometimes maligned them and greatly resented the attention which was paid to the charges. Finally she abolished slavery, and allotted a very inadequate sum as compensation to the South African slave owners, much of which sum never reached their hands, because it was made payable in London. These grievances, coupled with displeasure at the unwillingness of the Government to prosecute the troublesome and costly wars against the south-coast Kafirs, who frequently raided cattle and burnt the houses of the farmers on the frontier, determined a large body of Dutch farmers and ranchmen to quit the colony altogether, and go out into the wilderness which stretched far away to the northeast, much of it, especially that which lay to the north, a waterless desert, but the eastern part reported by the few hunters who had traversed it to contain plenty of good pasture. About ten thousand thus set off, and, when they had advanced beyond the borders of the colony, spread themselves over a tract of country some seven hundred miles long by three hundred broad, between the Orange River on the west-southwest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the lower course of the Limpopo River on the north-northeast. Parts of this country lay empty of all inhabitants. Parts were inhabited by savage Kafir tribes, the more warlike of whom attacked the emigrants, and were defeated, and in some cases expelled by the latter, whose valor, whose firearms and whose horses enabled them to overcome enormously more numerous hosts of undisciplined natives. This emigration of 1836 is known as the Great Trek, and the Dutch who formed it are usually described by their own name of Boers, a word meaning farmers or peasants. It is convenient to call them by this name for the sake of distinguishing them from the more numerous and more sedentary Dutch who remained behind in Cape Colony as British, though, strictly speaking, every farmer or ranchman would be described in the Dutch language by the name of Boer.

This Great Trek of 1836 has been the source of all subsequent troubles between the Dutch and English races in South Africa. The circumstances attending it developed in the minds of the emigrant Boers three passions which have characterized them ever since, and which must be understood, because they are the key to the subsequent history of the country. One of these is a deep dislike to the British Government, which they conceived to have forced them to quit their old homes by a course of injustice and oppression. Another is a love of independence for its own sake, a sentiment which is in their Dutch and Huguenot blood (for some of the leading families were sprung from French Huguenots, who had gone to Africa from Holland after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes), and which had shown itself, even before England took the Cape, in risings against the Government of the Dutch East India Company. A third is an ardent attachment to their Calvinistic faith and to their old habits and usages. Cut off from all the influences of Europe, and leading a rude and solitary life on their enormous ranching farms, they were, when they went out into the wilderness, nearly two centuries behind the people of Western Europe in the thoughts, as well as in the arts, of modern civilization. The conditions of their warlike life among hostile savages after the Trek kept them so backward that they might really be said to belong rather to the seventeenth century than to the nineteenth.

Their virtues, as well as their faults, were of a seventeenth-century type, and have remained, in the more remote and thinly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peopled regions, still of that type—a fact which came into sharp relief when, within the last few years, a new crowd of English gold-seekers poured in among them. The old type has partially survived even among the more civilized Dutch of Cape Colony, and this has helped to keep up the sense of brotherhood between the emigrant Boers and their kinsfolk at the Cape.

Before I describe the relations of these emigrants to the British Government from 1836 to the present day, it may be well to say a few words about the natives, who constituted the vast majority of the inhabitants of the country.

When the first European settlers came, they found three races in the country—the Bushmen, a low type of aborigines, who lived by the chase; the Hottentots, savages of a somewhat higher order, who had sheep and cattle, but did not till the ground, and the Kafirs. The Bushmen were very few, and have now almost disappeared. They could not learn civilized ways or survive contact with a civilized people. The Hottentots, too, vanished, many tribes being swept off by smallpox, while the rest have either died out or become mixed with the negro slaves whom the Dutch brought from the coasts of Guinea. The Kafirs, however, have held their ground and even multiplied. The Dutch, and afterward the English, have carried on many sanguinary wars with them, for they are fierce in fight, as well as strong, muscular men. The last of these wars was that which the British South African Company waged against the Matabele in 1893, renewed by a native revolt in 1896; and it may be hoped that it is the last that will have to be waged, at any rate to the south of the Zambesi River, for the tribes have now begun to realize the hopelessness of resistance to the discipline and the superior arms of the white men. These wars were, all of them, except that against the Matabele, fought out along, or not far from, the coasts of the Indian Ocean, because the northern parts of the country, on both sides of the lower and middle course of the Orange River, is a desert region, which has no inhabitants, save a few wandering Hottentots and Bushmen. The result of the wars was to make the English masters of the whole country (except, of course, the Portuguese and German territories) which lies along the coast from Cape Town as far as the neighborhood of Delagoa Bay. The natives never took part in any of the conflicts between the English and the Dutch, to which I am going to refer, but their presence in several instances affected

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those conflicts, because the English more than once stopped the Boers when the latter were conquering some native tribe, and because the English Government sometimes declared that the relations between the Boers and the natives constituted a danger to the peace of the country generally, which made their own interference necessary. It must, therefore, be remembered that the rivalry between the Boers and the English, the course of which is now to be sketched, went on, not *in vacuo,* so to speak, but in the presence of a native population far outnumbering the English and the Boers taken together.

When the Boers trekked out into the wilderness in 1836, the British Government, though sorry to see them go, did not follow them. It did not wish to possess the interior of South Africa, because it did not think the country worth having. It valued the Cape chiefly as a half-way house to India, for in those days the Suez Canal had not begun to be even talked of. Neither in those days had the passion for acquiring territory outside the pale of civilization seized upon the European Powers. Least of all did they desire African territories, because all Africa (except the strip along the Mediterranean) was believed to be either hopelessly barren or hopelessly unhealthy, the parts which were uninhabited, worthless; the parts which were inhabited, full of savages whom it would be costly to subdue, and from whom, when they had been subdued, little profit could be drawn. Accordingly, the British neither sent troops after the departing emigrants, nor deemed the emigrants to be acquiring the interior for Great Britain. Still, they did deem the emigrants to be still British subjects, for, as they had not become subjects of any other State, it was held they must still owe allegiance to the British Crown. This notion has in a vague sense never quite vanished from the British mind ever since. The emigrants, however, held that when they went out they renounced their British allegiance, and forthwith began to set up rude republican governments for themselves, governments which were managed by a meeting of all the adult males (called a Volksraad or People's Council), and in time of war—nearly all times being times of war—also by a smaller elective committee called a Council (Krygsraad). As the emigrants were scattered over an area of some three hundred thousand square miles, and were, even in 1846, ten years after the first of them left the Colony, less than twenty thousand in num-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber, all told, it was impossible for them to have one Volksraad or one Government for the whole body. The various parties or communities, when they began to crystallize into communities, got on as they best could, each with its own Volksraad. After a time this became a small representative body, but when it was a primary assembly, the number of persons present was usually smaller than that of a town meeting in rural New England.

The British Government soon found itself, or thought itself, compelled to abandon its original policy of indifference to the doings of the emigrants, and so there began that struggle for the possession of the extra-colonial parts of South Africa, which has been the central stream of South African history for more than half a century. The first collision took place in what is now the Colony of Natal, a region then separated from Cape Colony by a mass of independent Kafir tribes, and itself ruled by the Zulu king Dingaan. Hearing of the fertility of this region, which is indeed one of the richest and best watered parts of Africa, a large body of Boer emigrants, who had been wandering over the great interior plateau, descended into it in 1838, and after a short but terrible struggle with Dingaan, who had treacherously massacred two parties of them, built the village of Pietermaritzburg (now the capital of Natal), and set up a republic which they called Natalia. This disquieted the British authorities at the Cape, who did not wish to see any non-British State established on the sea coast. The interior they did not much care about, because in the interior the Boers would be in contact with the natives only. But an independent republic on the coast, flying its own flag, was another affair. They were, moreover, afraid that trouble between the emigrants and the coast Kafirs might breed further trouble between the coast Kafirs and themselves. Accordingly, they sent (in 1842) a small British force to Durban (then called Port Natal), the best harbor on the coast, though they had some years before withdrawn a detachment which had been placed there, and had not complied with the request of the handful of English settlers who lived there to recognize them as a colony. The British troops were besieged by the Natalian Boers, but in the nick of time received reinforcements, which so completely turned the scale that the Boers presently submitted. The Republic of Natalia vanished, and many of the Boer emigrants returned north across the mountains, prizing their independence more than the good

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pastures of Natal, and full of resentment at the Government which had stepped in to deprive them of the fruit of their victory over the Zulu king. Thus ended the first of the four armed collisions which have occurred between the English and the Boers, the first of their many strivings for the possession of the unappropriated parts of Africa.

Meanwhile, the interior was in a state of confusion and disorder, the Boers being too few in number to reduce to submission their native enemies, and the half-breed hunting clans called Griquas, the offspring of Dutch fathers and Hottentot mothers, who lived in the northeastern border of Cape Colony. The British Government, after fruitless attempts to create petty semi-independent States out of these unpromising materials, yielded to the pressure of events, and moved forward the frontier of its influence by annexing the country between the Orange River and the Vaal River, thereby asserting authority over such of the Boer emigrants as dwelt in this region. They named it the Orange River Sovereignty, and built a fort in it at a spot called Bloemfontein. This took place in 1846. Some of the Boers, unwilling to come again under British dominion, took up arms, and with the help of other Boers beyond the Vaal, overpowered the small British garrison. A British force was led against them by the Governor of the Cape, a tried soldier of the Peninsular War, who defeated them in an engagement and re-established British authority. But the troubles showed no sign of ending. A large Kafir tribe, the Basutos, who occupied the mountainous country south of the Orange River Sovereignty, and were formidable both by their numbers and by the difficult nature of their country, attacked the British force in the Sovereignty on one side, while the Boers from beyond the Vaal threatened it on another. It so happened that Cape Colony was at the same time involved in a war with the Kafirs of the south coast, so that troops could not be spared for these more remote districts, while there was not time to fetch any from England, then far more distant than now. Besides, the Government at home were getting tired of the vexations which their presence in the far interior caused them. They saw nothing to be gained by the possession of wide, pastoral wastes, where it was extremely difficult to keep order, difficult to control the rough white settlers, difficult to bridle the restless mass of Kafirs. Accordingly, the British Cabinet made up its mind to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take what would now be called an act of self-denying and perhaps pusillanimous renunciation, but was then regarded as an exercise of obvious common sense. It resolved to withdraw altogether from the interior, release the emigrant Boers from any claim it might still have to their allegiance and leave them and the Kafirs to fight out their quarrels without further interference. In 1852, a treaty—known as the Sand River Convention—was made with representatives of the Boers who dwelt beyond the Vaal River, which guaranteed to them "the right to manage their own affairs and to govern themselves according to their own laws, without any interference on the part of the British Government." It was also thereby declared that no slavery should be permitted or practised by the Boers beyond the Vaal. Two years later, after a troublesome war with the Basutos, in which the British general narrowly escaped a serious reverse, had confirmed the disposition of the Government to withdraw, another Convention was made at Bloemfontein, by which the Boers living in the Sovereignty between the Vaal and Orange Rivers were "declared to be a free and independent people," and the future independence of the country and its government was guaranteed. The British garrison was thereupon withdrawn from the Sovereignty, which was left to set up a government on its own account, subject, however, to a provision forbidding slavery and the slave trade—a provision not superfluous in either Convention, for the Boers were suspected of practising a system of apprenticing native servants which was with difficulty distinguishable from slavery. Both the great English parties were concerned in this abandonment of the interior, for the Convention of 1852 was approved by the Cabinet of Lord Derby; that of 1854 by the Cabinet of Lord Aberdeen. Neither Convention excited any remonstrance in England, so little did men then care for colonial expansion in general or African territory in particular.

From these two recognitions of Boer independence there sprang up two Boer republics. After sixteen years of practical but legally unacknowledged independence, the emigrants who lived beyond the Vaal, and now began to be called Transvaal people, were at length masters of their own destinies. They were, however, divided into several small communities, as well as into numerous contending factions, and did not finally unite into one State till 1864. The Orange River farmers were less quarrelsome and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

better educated, and, as they lived nearer the Colony, they were less rude, being, moreover, mixed with a certain number of English settlers. Their Republic took the name of the Orange Free State, and gave itself a very short and simple constitution, which has worked smoothly. It was for a time plagued by wars with the Basutos, but since the British Government assumed control over that tribe in 1869 these have ceased. The country is mostly too dry for agriculture, but it is covered with excellent pasture, which supported, until the great cattle plague of 1896, vast herds of cattle. Fortunately, no gold mines have been discovered, and only one diamond mine, so the temptations of wealth have not corrupted the simplicity of these republicans, who lived happily together till the outbreak of the present war, Englishmen sharing with Boers the offices of the State.

The Transvaal Republic was less fortunate. Its people were rather fewer in number, and were scattered over a wider territory. They were much rougher in habits, much more ignorant, much fonder of raiding the natives and more prone to discord among themselves. What with their intestine divisions, their native wars and their unwillingness to pay taxes, their Government was carried on with great difficulty and had, in 1877, become not only bankrupt, but virtually unable to enforce obedience. The British Government, which thought, rightly or wrongly, that the weakness and disorder of the Republic constituted a danger to the surrounding territories by inviting native attacks, sent a Commissioner to the Transvaal, who, in April, 1877, used the discretion which the Colonial Office had entrusted to him to proclaim the annexation of the country to the British Crown. It was a high-handed act, for the Republic had enjoyed complete independence, and Britain had no more legal right to annex it than she had to seize the neighboring territories of Portugal. The only justification was to be found in the circumstances of the State, which had only three dollars in its treasury, with no prospect of obtaining any more, because the citizens, who distrusted the President on account of his supposed theological errors, seemed to care very little whether they had a government at all, and were certainly unwilling to contribute to its support. It was believed that Cetewayo, the powerful and martial Zulu king, was likely to attack it, and the Commissioner doubtless believed that the public opinion of the Boer people, of whom there were now some forty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thousand, would approve—or at any rate would not actively resent—his conduct in placing them under a power which would defend them against Cetewayo and spend money on their country. The event, however, proved that he had acted foolishly, because precipitately. If he had waited a few weeks or months longer, it is possible, indeed probable, that the Boers would have asked him to promise them a British protectorate. But they did not like to have it thus thrust upon them; and, while the authorities of the Republic entered solemn protests, a memorial was drawn up and signed by a large majority of the citizens addressed to the British Government, and praying that the annexation should be reversed. Britain, however, refused to give way, believing that the opposition of the Boers would soon disappear, especially when they saw that English rule must conduce to the material prosperity of the country.

Unfortunately, the Colonial High Commissioner and the Colonial Office at home did not take the obviously proper steps to conciliate the people. They sent an arrogant and politically incapable military officer to govern men in whom the sentiment of democratic equality was extremely strong. They levied taxes stringently. They delayed so long in giving the free local government they had promised that the people despaired of ever receiving it. The passive displeasure which had at first showed itself now turned to active discontent; and when the leaders of that discontent found that the new English Ministry which came into power in April, 1880, just three years after the annexation, refused to reverse the act of their predecessors, they prepared to recover their independence by force of arms. In December, 1880, an insurrection broke out. The insurgents were few in number, but the British troops in the country were still fewer and wholly unprepared, so they were obliged to surrender or were shut up and besieged in a few fortified posts. A Boer force seized the chief pass leading from the Transvaal into Natal, because this was the route which an English army coming to reconquer the country would be sure to take. Here they repelled a small English force, for the English had as yet very few soldiers in Natal, and shortly afterward (February 26, 1881) defeated and killed the English commander, General Colley, who, with a want of prudence that has never been accounted for, led a detachment to the top of a mountain (Majuba Hill) commanding the pass, without taking

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proper steps to guard the position or to secure support from the rest of his force. There were loud cries in England that vengeance should be taken for this defeat, which could easily have been avenged, for in a few weeks reinforcements arrived far too strong for the Boers to resist. But the British Government, much to its credit, gave no heed to these cries. It was to blame for having failed sooner to discover the real state of things in the Transvaal, and for not having done its best, by a prompt removal of grievances, to appease the discontent of the people. But, now that it knew the facts; knew that the hasty annexation had been a blunder; knew how much the Boers valued their independence; knew how strong was the sympathy felt for them by the Dutch element all over South Africa—a sympathy which might have ended in a war with the Free State and a civil war in Cape Colony—they determined to undo the annexation of 1877. A Convention was accordingly concluded in August, 1881, with the provisional government which the Transvaal people had set up. By this instrument, Britain recognized the Transvaal State as autonomous, reserving to herself, however, the control of all foreign relations, and declaring the suzerainty of the Queen. The Cabinet of Mr. Gladstone was warmly attacked in England for its action in thus, as its opponents said, weakly surrendering to rebels, while others held that it had acted not only magnanimously, but also wisely, since the evil of a race conflict between English and Dutch in South Africa far outweighed the objections to sitting down under a defeat, especially when all the world knew that the defeat could have been easily avenged, were mere vengeance a proper object of war.

Men still wrangle over the question in England, and may long continue to do so, for it is to some extent a moral as well as a political question, and different minds view moral problems differently. Regarded as a pure matter of politics, it may be pronounced to have been right, upon the *data* which the British Government then possessed, for there was nothing to be gained by reconquering a large country of slender value, and by undertaking to rule over a mass of disaffected subjects, while the danger of a race war in South Africa was to be at all hazards avoided. Nevertheless, as things have in fact turned out, much of the good which was then reasonably expected has failed to be secured. The Boers who deemed, and were indeed justified in deeming, the annexa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of 1877 to have been an act of pure force, which gave the British Crown no *de jure* title to their allegiance, thought that when the insurrection had succeeded, their Republic ought to have been replaced in its old position under the Sand River Convention, a position of perfect independence. They, therefore, showed little gratitude for the concession of practical autonomy, and did not resign the hope of ultimately regaining complete independence. Besides, though they could not but see that the British Ministry had refrained from using their superior power to take vengeance which might have been easily taken, they knew that the danger of alienating the Cape Dutch had been one of the motives which determined its conduct. However, the whole question might, and probably soon would, have lost its importance but for an event which happened four years after, the discovery in the Transvaal of a gold field unique in the world.

When the Transvaal Boers had recovered their rights of internal self-government, they immediately began to work for two things: the concession of complete independence, such as they had enjoyed under the Sand River Convention, and the extension of their influence over the native territories that lay around them. Their War of Independence had stimulated in an amazing degree their national feeling, and had revived in them that bold and venturesome spirit which marked the first years after the Great Trek. Territorial expansion is, moreover, almost a necessity to them, because they live entirely by ranching, and need fresh pastures as the population increases. They began to spread out to the south into Zululand, and succeeded in establishing a petty republic there, which was afterward absorbed into the mother State. They attempted similar tactics on the west in Bechuanaland, but here the British Government interposed. It had been appealed to by the English missionaries, who disliked the Boers because they dealt harshly with the natives; and it was unwilling to see a region which might become important as opening a path from the Cape to Central Africa closed against it by the presence of another Power. Accordingly, an expedition was sent which chased the Boer adventurers out of Bechuanaland, and placed the Kafir tribes who dwelt there under British protection. There now remained only the country to the east and to the north of the Transvaal to be contended for by the Dutch and English races. To the east the Boers succeeded, after a long diplomatic controversy with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain, in getting hold of Swaziland, a small native territory inhabited by a branch of the Zulu race. They would have liked to go still further and reach the coast of the Indian Ocean, but Britain anticipated them by stepping in to proclaim a protectorate over the Kafir chiefs, who held the unhealthy little strip of land that lies between Swaziland and the sea. This was in 1894. On the north the British Government, who had again begun to doubt the wisdom of annexing huge slices of Africa—though the tide of English sentiment was now setting strongly for expansion—refused to occupy the country which lay between the Limpopo River and the Zambesi. But it did not refuse to allow one of its enterprising subjects to obtain a charter from the Crown founding a company intended to acquire land and work mines in that country. Mr. Cecil Rhodes, an Oxford graduate, and son of an English country clergyman, who had made a fortune at the Kimberley diamond mines, was the person who conceived this plan, and by whom the charter creating the British South Africa Company was procured. Under his auspices, a band of English settlers entered the unappropriated and little-known regions of Manica Land and Mashonaland, and, in 1890, set up a government there. They were just too quick for the Boers, who had meditated a trek into the same region, where there is plenty of good pasture. Three years afterward the company established its power over the wide area of Matabeleland, west of Mashonaland, by a war with the martial tribe of Matabele, whose king, Lo Bengula, fled away and died. With these events the long rivalry for the possession of the interior between Dutch and English came to an end, and the Transvaal found itself surrounded on all sides by British territory, except on the northeast, where it abuts upon the dominion of Portugal. Those dominions, however, it could not acquire from Portugal even if Portugal were willing to sell them, because Britain has by treaty a right of pre-emption of the district round Delagoa Bay, the harbor which both the Boers and the English would be so glad to obtain. On the whole, therefore, the English came off winners; for, whereas the Boers get only Swaziland and part of Zululand, their rivals secured the vast areas of Bechuanaland on the west, of Mashonaland and Matabeleland on the north.

In its other aim, the recovery of independence, the Transvaal Government had a nearly complete success. In 1884 they per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suaded the late Lord Derby, then Colonial Secretary in the British Cabinet, to agree to a new Convention, whose articles supersede those of the Convention of 1881. This later instrument sensibly enlarges the rights and raises the international status of the "South African Republic" (a title now conceded to what had been called in 1881 the "Transvaal State"). Under the Convention of 1884, the British Crown retains the power of vetoing any treaties which the Republic may make, except with the Orange Free State. But the Republic is entitled to accredit diplomatic representatives to foreign courts; the protection of the natives is no longer placed under the care of a British Resident; the internal administration of the State is left entirely free from any sort of British control. The Republic is, in fact, with the important exception of the treaty-making power, to all intents and purposes independent. Most people in England now blame Lord Derby, who was certainly an unlucky Colonial Minister, for making this Convention. But his error—and it was an error—would have signified comparatively little, but for the event which befel immediately after it was committed. The Convention was signed in 1884. In 1885 the auriferous conglomerate beds of the Witwatersrand were discovered in the southern part of the Transvaal. They form not only the richest gold field in the world, but a gold field unlike any other in giving a fairly uniform and certain yield of so much gold, rather greater in some beds, rather less in others, to the ton of ore. Until this discovery, the Transvaal had been, though a few gold reefs were being worked in the mountains on its eastern border, really a vast pastoral wilderness, very poor, and with only about one and a half white inhabitants to the square mile, most of them semi-nomad ranchmen. It was a country somewhat like New Mexico, though the population was smaller and the pasture thinner. Now a stream of immigrants from the rest of South Africa, from Europe, from Australia, from North America, began to rush in, so that within a few years the white population more than trebled.

The first result of this great and sudden change was to enrich those few of the Boer farmers who had owned and who now promptly sold the land where the gold beds were worked, and also to benefit a somewhat larger number by creating a market for agricultural produce. The revenue of the State, which had been trifling, began to rise rapidly. This was so far good. But the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Government soon bethought themselves that the new comers (most of whom were British), when they had become citizens and began to cast their votes, would constitute a large section, and before long a majority, of the voters. They would then be able, by electing persons like themselves to the Assembly and to the executive offices of the State, to revolutionize it completely, swamping the old citizens, getting rid of the old-fashioned Boer ways—in fact, making the country an English instead of a Dutch country. From this prospect they recoiled in horror. It was not in order to be overrun at last by a crowd of English, Australian and American miners, employed by capitalists, mostly of Jewish extraction, that they or their fathers had trekked out of Cape Colony, fought and vanquished the hosts of heathen Kafirs, founded their own Republic, thrown off by their valor the yoke which England had for four years laid upon them. To keep out the immigrants and forbid the working of the mines might be difficult, and this course would, moreover, sacrifice the growing revenue which was raised from the mines. They, therefore, resolved to keep the immigrants, but to exclude them, at least for a good while to come, from exerting political power. This was done by lengthening the period of residence and other formalities prescribed for the acquisition of burgher rights and therewith of the electoral franchise. The method has been much denounced, and it has turned out badly, as the sequel has showed. But it was an obvious form of self-preservation. Those who have made a country, and are ruling a country; those who like the country as it is and object to new-fangled ways, cannot be expected to open their arms to new-comers and invest them with the fulness of their own political privileges. The immigrants complained bitterly that everywhere else in South Africa a settler from Europe could get a vote after two or three years' residence; why, then, not in the Transvaal also? The answer was that the Transvaal was the only part of South Africa where the new settlers were becoming more numerous than the old citizens; where, therefore, admission after three years' residence might mean a complete transfer of political control to a wholly new set of people, differing in thoughts, habits, tastes and language from the folk that had theretofore possessed the land. What are the "natural rights" of these two sets of persons, and by what kind of compromise the justice of this very exceptional case ought to be met, is a question which I leave to the reader.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But unluckily for both the old Boers and the immigrant settlers (or *Uitlanders,* as they are commonly called), the matter was complicated by another fact. The Boers were an ignorant and rude people. They were skilful hunters, strenuous fighters, pious Calvinists, and endowed with many excellent qualities. But they were quite without the sort of knowledge and skill that are needed to administer a modern State, and especially one which, having become the field of a great industry, was swiftly growing in wealth and population. Accordingly, the administration which they provided for the new settlers was very inefficient and very costly. Moreover, the virtues which had adorned their rustic simplicity yielded, in too many instances, to the temptations presented by the control of a large revenue and by the power of granting valuable concessions. Thus the Administration became not only inefficient, but to some extent corrupt. As measles, which in civilized countries is only a passing childish ailment, has sometimes proved, when introduced among savage peoples, a deadly plague, so the bacillus of pecuniary corruption, which the great States of Western Europe have pretty well extirpated from their civil services and legislatures, sometimes appears as a virulent malady in communities where there had previously been too little wealth for the formation of a *nidus* fit for its growth. Thus it came to pass that, while the material prosperity of the Transvaal increased, its Government, so far from improving, became worse than before. It did not supply what a progressive industrial community needs; and it was certainly not altogether pure, though how far the impurity went is a matter of so much controversy that I will not venture to express a positive opinion.

Under such conditions, it was not strange that the new settlers should have soon become discontented. They complained that they were given neither good administration, nor any constitutional means of securing it. Being far richer than the old burghers, they paid nearly all the taxation, but had no voice in the disposal of the revenue. If the Administration had been reformed, their exclusion from the franchise would have sunk to a mere theoretic grievance. If the franchise had been granted to them, it would have been their own fault had the Administration remained unreformed. But, as things were, they felt aggrieved, and found no means of removing their grievances. Constitutional agitation was tried, but as they had few sympathizers in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Legislature, which consisted chiefly of old-fashioned Boers from the country, nothing came of it. Then a few of the leaders formed, in the end of 1894, or beginning of 1895, a secret plan for rising in arms against the Government. The objection to this plan was that while the Boers were all expert riflemen, few of the Uitlanders had arms, and still fewer were trained to use them. However, they persevered. Some of the capitalists came into the plan, for though capitalists do not as a rule favor revolutions, this particular revolution would have benefited the mine owners, by enabling them to work the gold reefs more cheaply and develop them more rapidly. Accordingly, they helped with money, and large stores of arms were secretly conveyed into Johannesburg, the city which had suddenly sprung into greatness in the center of the mining district. Then, too, Mr. Cecil Rhodes, at that time Prime Minister of Cape Colony, and managing director of the British South Africa Company, came into the plan, and brought into it Dr. Jameson, administrator of the territories of that company, and able to direct the movements of the body of mounted police which the company maintained.

In a book called "Impressions of South Africa," which was published two years ago, I have, besides sketching the history of the Boers, described pretty fully the circumstances which led to the formation of this plan, the motives which induced different sections of the inhabitants to favor it, and the causes which led to its failure. The story cannot be told here, for it is very much involved, and hardly admits of being told briefly; nor is the whole of it yet known to the public, although two Parliamentary Committees, one of the Cape Assembly, one of the British House of Commons, have investigated the matter at great length. The point best worth noting is this, that the conspiracy might possibly have succeeded if it had been allowed to remain a pure Uitlander conspiracy at Johannesburg. But there was superadded to it an arrangement that Dr. Jameson, with a force of the company's armed and mounted police, should come in to help the insurrection which was to break out at Johannesburg. The conspirators, finding some difficulties crop up, postponed the day of the rising. But Dr. Jameson, becoming impatient of delay, started on the day originally fixed (in the end of December, 1895), before they were ready to meet or receive him. He was stopped by a rapidly summoned Boer force, and obliged, with all his men, to capitulate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Johannesburg leaders, who had raised their followers so far as they could at short notice, on hearing of Dr. Jameson's departure, were then also obliged to lay down their arms, and the whole movement collapsed.

Its consequences, however, remained, and most pernicious have they been. All the subsequent troubles of South Africa, including the outbreak of the present war, are due to this Johannesburg rising, or rather to the still more unhappy expedition of the company's police, which is now commonly called the Jameson Raid. The dislike which the bulk of the Transvaal Boers felt for the British Government, already sufficiently pronounced, was intensified. The reforming party among the Boers, not very large, but including men of talent and influence, was discouraged, and has been able to effect little or nothing ever since. The power of the President, Mr. Paul Krüger, whose strength of character, long official experience, and intimate knowledge of the character of his countrymen, have given him an unequalled influence over them, has been further increased; and it has unfortunately been used to arrest all changes. Little or nothing had been done down to June last, either to improve the Administration or to conciliate the Uitlander population by making it easier for them to acquire citizenship, and therewith a permanent interest in the country and a share of political power. The policy of repression had been pursued, not only by restricting the right of public meeting and of writing in the press, but also by the construction of a fort to dominate Johannesburg and by the continued importation of large quantities of munitions of war. These latter precautions were perfectly natural. Any Government which had escaped destruction so narrowly as did that of President Krüger in December, 1895, would have done the like. The mistake was, that measures of reform were not made to go hand in hand with measures of defense. If the Uitlanders were not to be admitted to citizenship, they ought at least to have been given a better administration. By this time they vastly outnumbered the Boers. Nobody knows the exact figures, but it is conjectured that the total number of Transvaal burghers and their families does not exceed eighty thousand, while that of the recent immigrants may reach one hundred and sixty thousand. Most of the former are scattered thinly over the country; nearly all of the latter are gathered in the mining district round Johannesburg, which is practically an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

English, or rather Anglo-Jewish, city, with a sprinkling of Australians, Americans, Germans and Frenchmen. (Among the Americans there have been some eminent mining engineers, who have brought their Californian experience and skill to bear upon the working of the auriferous strata.)

The effect of the Jameson expedition was no less mischievous in other parts of South Africa than in the Transvaal. It roused Dutch feeling, which as a political force was almost dying out in the British Colonies, into more than its old vehemence. The Orange Free State, which had up till December, 1895, condemned the exclusive policy pursued by President Krüger's Government, now rallied to its sister Republic, not only from a sense of kinship, but because it believed its own highly prized independence to be in danger. It concluded a treaty with the Transvaal by which each of the two Republics bound itself to defend the other if unjustly attacked. In Cape Colony the two political parties, which had latterly been divided by lines of economic interest rather than by racial feeling—for the one was the party of the agriculturists and stock-farmers, the other of the commercial townsfolk—became identified with the two races, and passion ran high between them. The Dutch accused the English of desiring to acquire the gold fields and blot out the two Republics. The English accused the Dutch of desiring to make all South Africa Dutch, and shake off the British connection; nor were they appeased by the fact that a Dutch majority in the Legislative Assembly, led by a Prime Minister who, though not himself of Dutch stock, had the support of the Dutch party, had in 1898 unanimously voted an annual sum of £30,000, sterling ($150,000), as the voluntary contribution of the Colony to the naval defense of the British Empire.

To an Englishman who examines the facts with calmness, six thousand miles away from the heated atmosphere of South Africa, both accusations appear equally groundless. There were, no doubt, some among the English who did desire to seize the richest gold field in the world, and were working hard to bring on war with that aim. There were other Englishmen, far more numerous, who longed to humble what they thought the arrogance of the Dutch, and, as they expressed it, "to wipe out Majuba Hill," for the English in South Africa, strange as it may seem, have never forgotten or forgiven that petty reverse. But the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great mass of Colonial English were wholly unaffected by the former, and only slightly affected by the latter motive. What they did wish was to bring down the pride of the Dutch, to vindicate the supremacy of England in South Africa, which they thought endangered, as well as to make the Uitlanders predominant in the Transvaal. With the Free State they had no quarrel. The Dutch, on the other hand, were proud of the existence of their two Republics, hoped to see them independent and prosperous, and desired to maintain among themselves what they call their Afrikander sentiment. But it was only a few of the more violent and fanciful spirits who dreamt of ousting England and turning all South Africa into one Dutch commonwealth. There is not, so far as one can ascertain from any evidence yet produced, the slightest foundation for the allegation, so assiduously propagated in England, that there was any general conspiracy of the Colonial Dutch, or that there existed the smallest risk of any unprovoked attack by them, or by the Free State, or by the Transvaal itself, upon the power of England.

This was the state of facts in South Africa, these the feelings of the various sections of its population, when the controversy which has led to the present war became acute. I must not attempt to describe the negotiations which went on during the summer and autumn of this year, or to apportion the blame for their failure between the British Government and that of the Transvaal. To do so would lead me into a criticism of the conduct of the Colonial Office and the Cabinet of Lord Salisbury; and I do not think it desirable that one who is actively engaged in political life in his own country should address to the public of another country strictures on his political opponents, even when he believes that party feeling has nothing to do with those strictures. I will therefore wind up this sketch by a few words on the legal position of the two parties to the war, a matter which is in the main outside the sphere of party controversy.

Under the Convention of 1884, which fixed the relations of Britain and the South African Republic, the latter had the most complete control of its internal affairs, and Britain possessed no more general right of interfering with those affairs than with the affairs of Belgium or Portugal. The suzerainty which has been claimed for her, if it existed (for its existence under the Convention of 1884 is disputed), related solely to the power of making

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treaties, and did not touch any domestic matter. When, therefore, the British Government was appealed to by the Uitlander British subjects who lived in the Transvaal to secure a redress of their grievances, her title to address the Boer Government and demand redress depended primarily upon the terms of the Convention of 1884, any violation of which she was entitled to complain of; and, secondly, upon the general right which every State possesses to interpose on behalf of its subjects when they are being ill-treated in any foreign country. Under these circumstances it might have been expected that the questions which would have arisen before Britain went to war for the sake of her subjects living in the Transvaal, would be these two:

First: Were the grievances of her subjects so serious, was the behavior of the Transvaal Government when asked for redress so defiant or so evasive, as to contribute a proper *casus belli?*

Secondly: Assuming that the grievances (which were real, but in my opinion not so serious as has been frequently alleged) and the behavior of the Transvaal did amount to a *casus belli,* was it wise for Britain, considering the state of feeling in South Africa, and the mischief to be expected from causing permanent disaffection among the Dutch population; and considering also the high probability that the existing system of government in the Transvaal would soon, through the action of natural causes, break down and disappear—was it wise for her to declare and prosecute war at this particular moment?

Strange to say, neither of these two questions ever in fact arose. That which caused the war was the discussion of another matter altogether, which was admittedly not a grievance for the redress of which Britain had any right to interfere, and which, therefore, could not possibly amount to a *casus belli.* This matter was the length of time which should elapse before the new immigrants into the Transvaal could be admitted to citizenship, a matter which was entirely within the discretion of the Transvaal Legislature. The Boers made concessions, but the British Government held these concessions insufficient. In the course of this discussion the British Ministry used language which led the Transvaal people to believe that they were determined to force the Boer Government to comply with their demands; and they followed up their despatches by sending troops from England to South

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Africa. They justified this action by pointing out (and the event has shown this to have been the fact), that the British garrison in South Africa was insufficient to defend the Colonies. But the Boers very naturally felt that if they remained quiet till the British forces had been raised to a strength they could not hope to resist, they would lose the only military advantage they possessed. Accordingly, when they knew that the Reserves were being called out in England, and that an army corps was to be sent to South Africa, they declared war, having been for some time previously convinced, rightly or wrongly, that the British Government had resolved to coerce them. They were in a sore strait, and they took the course which must have been expected from them, and indeed the only course which brave men, who were not going to make any further concessions, could have taken. And thus the question whether the grievances amounted to a *casus belli* never came up at all. The only *casus belli* has been the conduct of the two contending parties during a negotiation, the professed subject of which was in no sense a *casus belli*. Some have explained this by saying that a conflict was in fact inevitable, and that the conduct of the two parties is really, therefore, a minor affair. Others hold that a conflict might have been and ought to have been avoided, and that a more skilful and tactful diplomacy would either have averted it, or have at any rate so managed things that, when it came, it came after showing that a just cause for war, according to the usage of civilized States, did in fact exist. No one, however, denies that the war in which England will, of course, prevail, is a terrible calamity for South Africa, and will permanently embitter the relations of Dutch and English there. To some of us it appears a calamity for England also, since it is likely to alienate, perhaps for generations to come, the bulk of the white population in one of her most important self-governing colonies. It may, indeed, possibly mean for her the ultimate loss of South Africa.

JAMES BRYCE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TRANSVAAL WAR AND EUROPEAN OPINION.

BY KARL BLIND.

I.

ALL Europe is united in condemning the attack made by the English Government upon the independence of the South African Republic, in violation of the clearest treaty rights solemnly guaranteed in London in 1884. In Germany, men of most diverse parties—from the moderate Constitutionalist, or even Conservative, to the advanced Liberal and Democrat—those that favor a Colonial policy as well as those who oppose or bitterly attack it—are of one mind in this matter. They all say: The war which is now raging over the fair fields of South Africa cries aloud against the outrageous conduct of those in power in England.

The most indignant among them bring to recollection the telegram which Emperor William sent to President Krüger after the defeat of Dr. Jameson's Raid. Here I may state at once a little-known fact. That telegram, generally supposed to have come from the Kaiser's personal initiative, was practically an answer to a message addressed to him by four hundred Germans at Pretoria who had offered themselves to President Krüger as a volunteer corps for the defense of the Republic. They had asked the Kaiser, on the arrival of the first news about the Raid, whether he would not say a word in favor of the threatened Boer Commonwealth.

It will be remembered that Krüger and the other members of the Transvaal Deputation, after having concluded the new Treaty in London, in 1883-4, went to Berlin for a visit. They were received in the most hospitable manner by the old Emperor William I. and his Chancellor; Prince Bismarck leading Mr. Krüger, with linked arms, to dinner, and talking to him in Low German, a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dialect closely akin to Dutch. From that time the relations between the restored South African Republic and the Berlin Government were especially friendly. This emboldened the Germans at Pretoria to send their telegram to William II., at a moment when the existence of the Boer Commonwealth hung in the balance. And it was in reply to their telegraphic question that the young Emperor expressed to President Krüger his congratulation for the escape from a grave danger.

Unfortunately, this single fact was suppressed. Had it been known, the wild, though utterly unjust, outcry which arose in England would probably have been less fierce. Three or four weeks afterward, when the mail from South Africa came in, I learned the real connection of what had occurred; but in the meantime the worst mischief had been done. First impressions are apt to last; they are as difficult to eradicate as the proverbial falsehood when it is once fairly, or unfairly, started.

What creates dissatisfaction now in Germany is that, during the late diplomatic controversies between England and the South African Republic, the official or semi-official press of Berlin should have assumed an attitude which was quite uncalled for. It turned round to an extent which offended the conscience of the nation. Certainly, everybody understood that if war were to break out it was not for Germany to take part in it. At the same time, the mass of the Germans—being "honest men," as Shakespeare says of them in one of his plays—expected that even the Government organs would not virtually play into the hands of those in England who were bent upon undoing the guaranteed independence of the Transvaal Republic. In all probability the official or semi-official press at Berlin was misled into its utterances by a belief that a compromise between England and the Boer Commonwealth would be effected, and that such a compromise would be promoted by taking sides, in a certain degree, with the demands put forth from London.

I may claim to have never shared that view. In a number of articles signed by me I over and over again expressed the conviction that war was the object of the prime movers in England, and that nothing remained for the threatened South African Republic—ay, and for the Orange Free State, too, whose fate would also be sealed if the former were subjected—than to defend its rights in alliance with the sister Republic against tremendous odds.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

In 1896 I was the first, I may truly say, to put the facts of the abolition of the suzerainty—which England had possessed in virtue of the Pretoria Treaty of 1881—clearly before the public in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. Having followed the negotiations in 1883-84, when I was in frequent contact with the Transvaal Deputation (President Krüger, General Smit, of Majuba Hill fame, and the Rev. I. S. Du Toit, the Minister of Public Instruction), I was able to give even personal testimony on that point. I can further say that when, in 1898, the Government of Pretoria met the astounding claims of suzerainty—which Mr. Chamberlain suddenly made after a lapse of thirteen years, during which Conservative and Liberal representatives of the Cabinet had openly and repeatedly confessed that no reservation of the Queen's suzerainty was expressed in the new Treaty of 1884—the arguments used by Dr. Leyds, in the name of President Krüger, were literally, and well-nigh in exactly the same order, given as had been done by me in the pages of this REVIEW.

The same may be said of the arguments used by Sir William Harcourt, Sir Edward Clarke (both eminent legists, the latter formerly a Solicitor-General in Lord Salisbury's previous Government), and other Liberal and Conservative leaders. This concurrence of views, and this remarkable coincidence, even in the marshalling of arguments and facts, may seem extraordinary. It is, however, easily explainable from the strength of the case.

Any one conversant with the text of the two Treaties and the negotiations which preceded them—as recorded in the Blue-Books—must literally come to the same conclusion. The pity is that so few politicians will take the trouble of going to the sources. I have discussed this subject for many years with a few members of Parliament, public writers and other generally well-informed men. As a rule I found among them the crassest ignorance on that particular matter. Most of them did not even know then that there were two distinct treaties, one of which had been abolished!

It was Lord Derby himself who, with his own hand, struck out everything referring to suzerainty from the old Treaty. The proof of it is contained in the Blue-Book. The suzerainty was cancelled and crossed out by him, with black lines, in the Preamble, as well as in the three paragraphs in which it is mentioned.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He then offered what he himself called "a New Treaty in substitution for the Convention of Pretoria."

A new Preamble was also given to that New Treaty. The Transvaal Deputation had come for the express object of having the suzerainty abolished and a new Treaty put in the place of the old one. They had also demanded that their country—which was until then called the "Transvaal State"—should be recognized once more as an "independent South African Republic," as it had been before the violent annexation which Mr. Disraeli had craftily effected while the burghers of the Republic were harassed by risings of the natives.

When the Transvaal Deputation returned to Pretoria, the Volks-Raad ratified the Treaty, because these objects of its Delegates had been attained. Dr. Leyds, and even Sir William Harcourt and Sir Edward Clarke, have overlooked one telling fact. It is this: While the Queen's suzerainty undoubtedly existed between 1881 and 1884, a so-called "Resident" was appointed at Pretoria to represent the British Crown in its suzerain capacity. Now, in 1884 the office of Resident was abolished and a Consul appointed in his stead. A Resident marks the country in which he acts as a vassal one. In the Parliamentary Statutes 52 and 63 Vict. (1889), c. 63, the protected Princes of India are described as "under the suzerainty of Her Majesty;" and at their Courts there is consequently a British Resident.

But in the Transvaal State, when it was restored to its old rank as the South African Republic, the Resident was replaced by a Consul, who henceforth was no longer a representative of a suzerain Protector, or Protectress, but who was, on the contrary, himself to "receive *the protection of the Republic.*" That restored independent Commonwealth was consequently acknowledged, by this fact too, as a foreign Power, no longer under a suzerain. Hence Mr. Chamberlain himself, during the Jameson Raid—that is, evidently, when its defeat was already telegraphically known in London—declared the South African Republic, in a despatch, to be "a *foreign State*, a *foreign Power*, with which Her Majesty is at peace and in Treaty relations."

Can anything be clearer, then, than the fact of the suzerainty having been abolished? Is it not arrant hypocrisy to assert the contrary? Yet, during all the recent transactions it was con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinually held as a threat over the Transvaal Republic. "Conventions," in the plural, was always the word.

Not even when President Krüger proposed that the controversy about Suzerainty should be "silently dropped" on both sides, so that an agreement about the Suffrage Question might be come to, would the Colonial Secretary avoid the mention of the Conventions in the plural, as if both were still lawfully in operation! Each time, moreover, the British terms were raised.

III.

The Treaty of 1884 gives England no right whatever to interfere in the internal affairs of the South African Republic. There is not a word in it about the right of foreigners to claim equality of suffrage rights with the native Dutch inhabitants. To obtain such rights foreigners have to conform to the existing laws. These laws for obtaining the vote were originally even more liberal than those existing in England. They were only made more restrictive —that is to say, a longer term of residence was fixed before a man could become a full burgher—when seditious aspirations for the overthrow of the Republic became ripe at Johannesburg. Among the motley crowd of foreigners there, a considerable number, even according to the testimony of the more fair-minded correspondents who were sent out by papers of the war party in England, is composed of utterly worthless characters. "I have never seen," one of them wrote, "within the course of a quarter of an hour, a worse collection of rascaldom of various kinds."

When President Krüger, some years ago, visited Johannesburg, the British flag was hoisted by such immigrants as a symbol of their insurrectionary desires. When Mr. Rhodes organized the Raid, Johannesburg was in arms, though courage failed the would-be rebels at the decisive moment.

Was it reasonable, then, to expect that, in dealing with a Suffrage Question, all these occurrences should simply remain unheeded by the President, the Parliament and the burghers of the Transvaal? Could they forget the destruction of their Commonwealth between 1877 and 1881? Were they simply to allow their Republic to be voted down, after it had been found that it could not be struck down by force of arms?

For all that, in order not to have to undergo a struggle on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

battle-fields with a World-Empire of nearly 400,000,000, Krüger and the Volks-Raad yielded more and more in the course of the negotiations. It was of no avail. They found themselves pressed each time by increased demands, while the English troops, of whom formerly there were but 3,000 at the Cape, were gradually increased to 25,000, and pushed forward to the frontiers of the two Republics—with even more troops announced to come afterward. Thus both Republics saw themselves menaced in their very existence, and they took the decisive, inevitable step.

In London, papers hostile to them had, in the meanwhile, before the outbreak of war, boldly declared that not suzerainty, but full Sovereignty was aimed at over the Transvaal, and that, though the Orange Free State was, by public law, as independent as Russia, British paramountcy over it, too, must be set up as a self-understood thing. In short, all respect for treaty rights and the independence of neighboring States was thrown to the winds. In Mr. Chamberlain's recent words, there must be, in South Africa, English "supremacy, preponderance, paramountcy—call it what you will, call it Abracadabra, if you choose." Out of so convenient a formula every act of violence may be evolved. Can it be wondered at that foreign nations look with mistrustful amazement upon such a doctrine? Would any country feel itself safe in the future, would any Government attach the slightest credence to the pledged word of, and the treaty stipulations accepted by, England, if Abracadabra is henceforth to be the parole?

Perhaps I may be allowed to mention here that, whatever I have done, by many writings, in furtherance of the Unionist cause of England, in opposition to Mr. Gladstone's fatal Home Rule bill, was once acknowledged by Mr. Chamberlain in terms of praise at a great public meeting. This cannot absolve me from the duty of saying what in Transvaal affairs I hold to be right. Again, I might say that when, in 1881, during the armed struggle of the burghers, there was a dark plan broached in London which would have increased the horrible Irish trouble of that time, I firmly set my face against that scheme, and it was nipped in the bud. It is as a friend of England, therefore, that I express my views.

And here I feel compelled to declare that violence is capped by unbearable cant when the hard-driven Republics, around whom the steel net was daily drawn tighter, are charged with having

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brought on this hideous war. You drive a man, forsooth, into a corner. You hold your fist before his face. You threaten him by saying that the sand of the hour glass is running out, and that, unless he makes haste to kneel down, you will use other measures against him. You hold your sword and gun ready to attack him; and then when he strikes a blow, *he* is, of course, the guilty party!

I say all this with a degree of sadness. I have known a nobler England, on some great historical occasions, since I first stepped on her soil as an exile after the great Continental Revolutions of 1848-49. On not a few occasions I have come forth to defend her cause—certainly not to my personal advantage, but the contrary. But there have not been lacking cases when the policy of England has been such that I could not shirk the duty of opposing it.

IV.

It is the same now. Who can doubt that this is a war as unrighteous as it is unnecessary, and pregnant with grave perils for England's own future? Has not General Butler, a man of the fullest personal experience in South African affairs, uttered a serious warning against lighting up such a conflagration? He had to leave his post for giving that wise and earnest counsel. Has not Mr. Selous, the Nimrod of Africa, who was one of the first to open up unknown territories there, and who is, according to Lord Crewe's testimony, intimately acquainted with all the leading political personages of the Dark Continent, uttered similar warnings? Mr. Selous, himself an Imperialist, yields to none in his desire for England's greatness.

Yet, though one of the very party which wants to have the vast British Empire still further enlarged, Mr. Selous also has given warning which unfortunately was not listened to. In a long letter to the *Times*, in which he refuted the many calumnies spread about in regard to the character of the Boer population—a letter written before the outbreak of the war, but the publication of which he was ordered to withhold under an assurance given to him from influential quarters that the war would be avoided at the eleventh hour—he said:

"At present I believe that the Dutch population of the Cape Colony are as a body thoroughly loyal to the British Crown; but it cannot be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

denied that Dutch Afrikander sentiment—the idea of becoming an independent nation—which was first aroused in South Africa by the unjust annexation of the Transvaal in 1877, and became stronger in 1880-81, gathered an extraordinary impetus at the time of the Jameson Raid. A war forced upon the Transvaal now by a demand for concessions which, however moderate they may appear in this country, are yet thought by the leaders of the South African Dutch in the Cape Colony and the Orange Free State to be unreasonable, will, as soon as the blood of their kinsmen is shed beyond the Vaal, make one people of them—a people that will be from henceforth bitterly, though possibly for a long time to come passively, hostile to British domination. Such a contingency should surely be avoided if possible, and surely the matter in dispute between Mr. Krüger and the Uitlanders might be settled by a Court of Arbitration formed from amongst the highest jurists of all the different States of South Africa. But, of course, if all arbitration or discussion of the points in dispute should be arbitrarily refused by the Colonial Secretary, it is difficult to see how war can be avoided; for the Transvaal Boers are an obstinate people, and will probably rather fight than climb down very low. In that case we shall have entered upon a course which, though it may give us the gold fields of the Transvaal for the present and the immediate future, *will infallibly lose us the whole of South Africa as a British possession within the lifetime of many men who are now living.* Through arrogance and ignorance Great Britain lost her American Colonies, and if arrogance and ignorance prevail in the present conduct of affairs in South Africa, history will repeat itself in that country."

Arrogance and ignorance have prevailed. The blood guiltiness of the war now raging lies, according to Mr. Selous's showing, at the door of the English Government. Arbitration would have prevented it. And arbitration between foreign Powers—of which Mr. Chamberlain acknowledged, in 1895-96, the South African Republic to be one—is perfectly feasible. But then he suddenly altered his standpoint. Contrary to his own clear assertion, he all at once declared, in open disregard of the Treaty of 1884, that England was the suzerain, the South African Republic the vassal.

When the lives of the captured Raiders were at stake, and a sentence of death had legally to be pronounced against them at Pretoria, it was found convenient in London to treat President Krüger with great courtesy. The Republic, which had escaped from a great danger, showed itself generous toward the prisoners. None of them was executed. Their sentences were commuted to fines. Their leader was handed over to England. President Krüger was praised by the Colonial Secretary for his magnanimity.

I may mention here a personal incident showing what most people in England expected at the time. The son of a well-known English sculptor had been among Dr. Jameson's men, and was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made prisoner at Krügersdorp. His mother, whom I had met in society, came in great distress to my house, expressing a fear that her son would be shot forthwith; she entreated me to intercede with President Krüger, with whom she had heard I was acquainted. I told her I was perfectly sure that no such fate would befall her son, and that the most likely thing—nay, I should say the certainty—was that he, being only one of the men and not an officer in the Raid, would soon be released. Immediately afterward the news came that he was set free.

In those days it was found useful in England to express hopes of "magnanimous" treatment being given to the prisoners; for everybody knew what would have been done by English justice to piratical raiders that had fallen into its hands. The capital punishment dealt out to raiders and insurgents in the Ionian Islands and in Canada is too well remembered to need special mention. Fearing the worst for Jameson and his companions, the English authorities were careful not to offend the South African Republic, but rather tried to humor it, so as to induce it to perform an act of generosity. Years afterward, however, it was to be pushed into vassalage, and bullied into armed resistance, so that its gold fields might be seized after a conquest. It was lightly assumed that this would be an easy war. After recent events, the *Times* has avowed that the advisers of Government were rather mistaken in their view.

V.

When the South African Republic at last mobilized its militia forces of yeomen in defense of its independence, London papers declared that this was not war, but simply a revolt—a revolt of the vassal. "The Boer Revolt" was used, day by day, as a title for the war news. The English Government itself refrained from mentioning the word "war." The supporters of Government asserted that the sending out of 25,000, of 50,000, perhaps of 70,000, men, or, if need be, even more, was simply "a *police* measure for the restoration of *order*" in the revolted territory of the Suzerain.

Imagine the consequences this would have had for the English soldiers now in Boer captivity, if the Governments at Pretoria and Bloemfontein had taken reprisals for such treatment as mere

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"rebels"! Happily, those Governments were more humane, and acted as belligerent foreign Powers toward their prisoners.

Compare, again, the refusal of the English Government to acknowledged these Republics as belligerent Powers with what, in May, 1896, Mr. Chamberlain had said in the House of Commons:

"In some quarters the idea is put forward that the Government ought to have issued an ultimatum to President Krüger, an ultimatum which would have certainly been rejected, and which must have led to war. Sir, I do not propose to discuss such a contingency as that. A war in South Africa would be one of the most serious wars that could possibly be waged. It would be in the nature of a civil war; it would be a long war, a bitter war, and a costly war. It would leave behind it the embers of a strife which I believe generations would hardly be long enough to extinguish. To go to war with President Krüger in order to force upon him reforms in the internal affairs of his State, in which Secretaries of State, standing in this place, have repudiated all right of interference—that would be a course of action as immoral as it would have been unwise."

Some months before that speech, which confirms everything Mr. Selous has said, Mr. Chamberlain declared in the House of Commons:

"I do not say that under the terms of the Convention we are entitled to force reforms on President Krüger, but we are entitled to give him friendly counsel. . . . If this friendly counsel was not well received, there was not the slightest intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government to press it. . . . I am perfectly willing to withdraw it, and to seek a different solution if it should not prove acceptable to the President. The rights of our action under the Convention are limited to the offering of friendly counsel, in the rejection of which, if it is not accepted, we must be quite willing to acquiesce."

Mark that Mr. Chamberlain here spoke in February, 1896, of the Convention—not of "Conventions." That latter idea came as an afterthought to him in 1897. In 1896, he still again said, when speaking of the Franchise Question:

"The answer that has hitherto been given, not on the part of the Government of the Transvaal, but on the part of some of its friends, was that to grant this request would be to commit suicide, inasmuch as, the moment the majority got the franchise, the first use they would make of it would be to turn out the existing Government of the Transvaal and substitute a Government of their own liking. ['Hear, hear,' and laughter.] I confess I thought there was some reason in that objection. It is rather difficult to attempt to persuade any one so capable as President Krüger that it would be desirable that he should proceed to his own extinction, and accordingly I brought before him an alternative suggestion which, at all events, would relieve him from that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difficulty. . . . The question is, whether President Krüger will consider that that proposal will endanger the security of the Transvaal Government. If he does, he will be perfectly justified in rejecting it."

In subsequent speeches, Mr. Chamberlain once more laid stress on the fact of the Dutch population being the large majority in South Africa, and on the great danger of the policy of going to war in opposition to the Dutch sentiment in the Cape Colony and in the Orange Free State. Even as late as August, 1896, answering Sir Ashmead Bartlett, Mr. Chamberlain said:

"What is the policy which the honorable gentleman would put forward if he were standing here in my place? We know what it would be. He would send, in the first place, an ultimatum to President Krüger that unless the reforms which he was specifying were granted by a particular date the British Government would interfere by force. Then, I suppose, he would come here and ask this House for a vote of £10,000,000 or £20,000,000—it does not matter particularly which [laughter]—and would send an army of 10,000 men, at the very least, to force President Krüger to grant reforms in regard to which not only this Government, but successive Secretaries of State, have pledged themselves repeatedly that they would have nothing to do with its internal affairs. That is the policy of the honorable gentleman. That is not my policy."

Is it not? Instead of 10,000 men, 25,000 are now out there, with double that number, or more, to follow. A vote for £10,000,000 has been taken; and another will, in all likelihood, have to be asked for. All the declarations formerly made have thus been falsified.

VI.

A word has now to be said about that alleged Boer "oligarchy" of which men contemptuously speak, who submissively salaam before the most antiquated forms and institutions of a Monarchy which still calls itself "by right divine," though in historical truth it is the issue of a successful Whig aristocratic Revolution.

The Boer oligarchy of the South African Republic is composed of simple farmers, every man of whom, from the age of sixteen up to sixty—nay, even mere boys of thirteen and men past seventy—stand together now on blood-soaked battle-fields for the defense of their country. That is their "corrupt" way of doing things. They have to meet the hired soldiers of an Empire in which, even after many hard popular struggles, a "hereditary oligarchy"—as Sir Wilfrid Lawson called it a few days ago—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still wields an extraordinary political and social power, while the Crown, going on the old Norman maxim, *"Dieu et mon droit,"* declares war, and makes peace, according to its own fancy.

I remember the time—it was long before Mr. Chamberlain had entered political life—when, out of about nine or ten million adult men in the United Kingdom, not more than one million had the vote. Strictly speaking, there were perhaps only eight hundred thousand to nine hundred thousand; for there were, as there are still, cumulative votes which an individual might possess. Elections not taking place everywhere on the same day, a man might cast his vote here and there, in town and country—as a householder, as a land owner, as a member of a university, and so forth.

What repeated violent struggles has it cost during the last thirty-five years—not to mention the Chartist agitation between the thirties and the beginning of the fifties—in order to obtain successive small instalments of electoral reform! I have vividly before my mind's eye the day when London was on the verge of revolution. I saw my friend, Mr. Edmund Beales, the leader of the Suffrage movement, sitting, before the march of the masses to Hyde Park, in the office of the Reform League, pale from excitement, with hat drawn over his brow, expecting, in much anxiety, the very worst. The Queen's troops were lying in ambush to prevent the entrance of the masses into the Park. Blood, it was feared, would be spilt, and unspeakable scenes of riot would then occur in those quarters of the working classes where there is an admixture of the criminal element. The railings of Hyde Park were on that day thrown down by the onset of the tumultuous crowds; an event at which I was personally present. Fortunately, the Queen, at the last moment, countermanded the order for the action of the troops. So I heard afterward from a friend in the War Office.

Again London had to be the scene of mass demonstrations, years afterward, in order to carry a measure for the partial enfranchisement of the rural population. To this day, nevertheless, there is no manhood suffrage. Some three to four millions are outside the pale of the electorate. I state this as a simple fact, knowing well enough that an indiscriminate right of suffrage among the utterly uninstructed may sometimes be the very means of overthrowing freedom and hindering intellectual and social progress.

But if considerations like these have weight with politicians

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in England, is a young African Republic, in its struggle for life, not entitled to look round as well, in franchise matters, for the sake of avoiding danger?

England has a hereditary House of Lords, which may cancel any Act passed by the Representatives of the People. Is that oligarchy, or not? Is it right, broadly speaking, to assume that capacity for legislation goes by heredity? I believe England has escaped from a great public danger through the rejection of Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill. But I doubt whether the House of Lords, in thus acting, was moved exclusively by patriotic instincts, so many of its members having landed estates in Ireland, and being rather fond of retaining their oligarchical privileges.

Since the Norman conquest, the real tillers of the English soil have been dispossessed of the land. Their number continually decreases. They are mere hands, landless wage-laborers, living in cottages not their own, from which they may be driven out, week by week, if it so pleases the aristocratic land owner or the large farmer he has put over them. Is it for a country with such feudal land-laws, the like of which does not exist in any European country, to speak of the free yeomen of the Boer Commonwealths as an "oligarchy"?

Again, looking at the ever increasing proletariate in the unwholesomely expanding large towns, to which the landless laborers flock for better means of support, would it not be better to deal in England itself with the root of a crying evil, than to fall upon a foreign Republic under the false plea of an oligarchy holding sway there?

VII.

The Dutch people of Cape Colony, according to Mr. Chamberlain's statement, made as late as April, 1896, "are just as loyal to the throne and to the British connection as, let me say, our French-Canadian fellow-subjects in the Dominion of Canada." In a speech made two months before, he said:

> "We are constantly reminded of the fact that our Dutch fellow-citizens are in a majority in South Africa, and I think I may say for myself as for my predecessor that we are prepared to go as far as Dutch sentiment will support us. It is a very serious thing—a matter involving most serious considerations—if we are asked to go to war in opposition to Dutch sentiment."

The loyalty of that population at the Cape was publicly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acknowledged in England when its Legislature made a yearly grant of £30,000 for increasing the English fleet in view of a possible conflict with France. This is an occurrence of quite recent date. Yet, all of a sudden, the waters were said to have been troubled, and the world was mysteriously told about a tremendous conspiracy for establishing a vast Afrikander Republic, involving the overthrow of English dominion at the Cape! For which deep reason the Transvaal was to be fallen upon, because there was the high seat of a great ambition. A sorrier farce it would have been impossible to concoct.

It is the *auri sacra fames,* the damnable hunger after gold, which has brought about this terrible war, in which, at any moment, the savage native races may come up to play their part with barbarous ferocity, to the terror and destruction of women and children left helpless in solitary farms. Is it to be wondered at that the kinsmen of the Transvaal people at the Cape, and in their original home in the Netherlands, are filled with indignation and deep wrath, and that there is an echo in the indignant voice of the whole civilized world?

Every close observer who has visited South Africa, even when going there with a biased mind, has usually come back with the conviction that it was in England's own interest not to act again as the aggressor toward the Transvaal Republic. England obtained forcible possession of the Cape Colony while Holland was overrun by France and lay under her iron heel. The Dutch inhabitants of that Colony, whose forefathers had created the settlement and introduced laws and institutions which hold good to this day, felt for a long time the foreign yoke imposed upon them. They, nevertheless, became, in course of time, perfectly loyal to the connection with England. This loyalty was put to a severe strain when that section of the Dutch inhabitants which first emigrated to Natal and then to the land beyond the river Vaal was relentlessly pursued by English troops.

The strain became still more severe by the lawless overthrow in 1877 of the Transvaal Republic, in the midst of its difficulties with the black natives. When in 1881—after several defeats of English detachments, chiefly at Majuba Hill—peace was concluded and a compromise effected, the Dutch population at the Cape applauded this tardy and even incomplete act of justice. Tardy and incomplete it was, for Mr. Gladstone, shortly before en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tering office, had characterized the annexation effected by Mr. Disraeli as a deed of downright "insanity," and acknowledged the right of the Boers to the restoration of their full independence in the most uncompromising terms.

Among those who had opposed the conclusion of peace in 1881 after the battle of Majuba Hill was the late Lord Randolph Churchill, a Conservative. Having in later years visited South Africa, he saw his error. This is what he wrote in "Men, Mines and Animals in South Africa:'

"The surrender of the Transvaal, and the peace concluded by Mr. Gladstone with the victors of Majuba Hill, were at the time, and still are, the object of sharp criticism and bitter denunciation from many politicians at home, *quorum pars parva fui*. Better and more precise information, combined with cool reflection, leads me to the conclusion that had the British Government of that day taken advantage of its strong military position and annihilated, as it could easily have done, the Boer forces, it would indeed have regained the Transvaal, but it might have lost the Cape Colony. The Dutch sentiment in the Colony had been so exasperated by what it considered to be the unjust, faithless and arbitrary policy pursued toward the free Dutchmen of the Transvaal by Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Theophilus Shepstone and Sir Owen Lanyon that the final triumph of the British arms, merely by brute force, would have permanently and hopelessly alienated it from Great Britain. Parliamentary government in a country where the Dutch control the Parliament would have become impossible, and without Parliamentary government Cape Colony would be ungovernable. The actual magnanimity of the peace with the Boers concluded by Mr. Gladstone's Ministry after two humiliating military reverses suffered by the arms under their control, became plainly apparent to the just and sensible mind of the Dutch Cape Colonist, atoned for much of past grievance, and demonstrated the total absence in the English mind of any hostility or unfriendliness to the Dutch race. Concord between Dutch and English in the Colony from that moment became possible, and that concord the Government of Mr. Rhodes inaugurated and has since to all appearances firmly riveted."

Lord Randolph Churchill wrote that before the Raid which Mr. Rhodes treacherously organized, after having attained to power at the Cape by the Dutch. It is easy to imagine what the late Tory statesman would have written on that subject after the disgraceful event. The conviction with which Lord Randolph Churchill became imbued, after he had studied matters on the spot, that the Transvaal would have been overcome, but that the Cape Colony might have been lost, is certainly a notable one in a Conservative. One thing only he forgot. Not only had Mr. Gladstone to think of the feelings of the Dutch population in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Colony, but also of the tremendous Irish difficulty in which England was then involved. It was a difficulty so great that it could scarcely be mastered by a garrison of 40,000 men in the unruly Sister Isle.

Nowhere is greater regret expressed at the existing state of things than among those German Liberal Constitutionalists who until now had steadfastly stood by England, trying to uphold her as an example of representative Government in opposition to their own Government's doings. They now turn away sorrowfully—nay, with expressions of open disgust.

It is with a greater sorrow than I can express that I have written all this. I deeply feel the danger to which this country, in which I have spent the better part of my life, has exposed itself with a light heart, in spite of an ever more darkening prospect of the future. But though so many ties bind me to England—nay, I will say for that very reason—I hold it to be a duty to speak out fearlessly, even as I did against Governments of my own native country when they outraged right and justice and kept Italians and Hungarians under their iron heel. This is the duty which I owe to the better England; and here I fulfil it.

KARL BLIND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WILL THE POWERS INTERVENE IN THE WAR?

BY FRANCIS CHARMES, FOREIGN EDITOR OF THE "*REVUE DE DEUX MONDES*"

FROM one end of Continental Europe to the other public sentiment is, we will not say hostile, but certainly opposed to England in regard to the war which she has just inaugurated against the little South African Republic. We believe there is not a single exception to this general statement, or, at least, no national exception, for there are of course individual ones. The conviction is current everywhere that England has been the real aggressor, although the actual rupture of the peace was the act of the Transvaal. The real author of a war is considered to be that nation which by its deliberate procedure has rendered it inevitable. Now, even if the Transvaal has committed, in its policy, or, rather, in its domestic administration, blunders and faults which have served England as a pretext, nobody doubts that she has looked forward to the approach of war with apprehension and sadness and that she has done all that was in her power to avert the scourge. The idea that the Transvaal desired the conflict and coolly provoked it cannot enter the mind of any reasonable man. Not so with England. The superiority of her strength—great indeed, though she may have had an exaggerated estimate of its immediate efficiency in a war of this kind—was an encouragement and a temptation to her. Hence the universal opinion in Europe is that nothing would have been easier for her than to avoid war if she had the will or even the serious desire, and that the war broke out because she did not have the desire and the will to prevent it. The odium of being the aggressor, therefore, falls upon her, and this odium could be dissipated only by a clear and cogent demonstration that great wrongs were on the side of the Transvaal.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This does not mean that no wrong is apparent on the part of the latter, for there even was a time when public sentiment was greatly opposed to the Republic. Probably all that would have been required on the part of England was to foster that sentiment and use it as a lever; but she neglected it and preferred the use of force. From the time of the Jameson raid, the sympathies of all have been with the Transvaal. That act was so disloyal and so brutal that it could not and did not fail to arouse unqualified reprobation. However, it soon appeared clear that all was not right at Johannesburg and that the situation of the Uitlanders there was intolerable in certain respects. If they exploited the country, the Boers for their part exploited them, taxing them by all known means of oppression and refusing them rights which might serve them as means of defense and protection. The complaints of the Uitlanders then appeared legitimate, and if they found an echo all over Europe, that echo was perhaps more distinct in France than anywhere else, and for the simple reason that about fifteen hundred millions of francs of French money are employed in the gold and diamond mines of South Africa. A reform in the inner situation of the Transvaal was therefore necessary, and it began to be demanded more and more imperiously, when the English Government took the matter in hand. Its intervention was at first hailed with favor; the happiest results were expected. But it was soon found that England was placing other interests of a different character alongside and even above the economic interests of the Uitlanders; in a word, that under cover of defending a general cause, she had in view a merely personal one which was entirely political.

The diplomatic publications, which followed in large numbers, confirmed this feeling, and it became evident when the results of the interview at Bloemfontein were made known. It was a surprise to hear that Sir Alfred Milner demanded for foreigners rights which were almost exclusively political, or, rather, electoral. The extreme importance which was attached in these discussions to the question whether the plenary right to vote should be enjoyed by the Uitlanders after five years of residence, or after seven or still more, seemed out of all proportion to the practical interest involved. In fact, the Uitlanders would have been perfectly satisfied with the granting of certain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

municipal rights in the Rand that were connected with the needs of their daily life, and they probably cared more for the unhindered continuation of their original nationality than for the acquisition of a new one which they would afterward have laid aside again as soon as possible. They protested, for example, against certain monopolies, which were positively oppressive, such as the dynamite monopoly. These, however, were hardly mentioned at Bloemfontein. Sir Alfred Milner, faithful to the instructions he had received from Mr. Chamberlain, laid down a political basis for the question; that is to say, a basis on which it was sure to clash with another—namely that of the internal sovereignty of the Transvaal, which the treaties had perhaps left in doubt, and which could not be touched, especially at such a moment, without extreme danger. From that day, people began to wonder whether England really meant to bring about a peaceful settlement, and they soon reached a negative conclusion. President Krüger clearly understood the case, and he would have done better if he had accepted the first propositions of the English. He would have placed them in a difficult situation by obliging them to declare themselves satisfied or to show their hands. These propositions were not such as could not be accepted, for he had to accept them later, unfortunately too late. The English had already formulated others. Mr. Chamberlain's adroitness consisted in continually shifting the ground, in constantly inventing new and more exorbitant demands until he tired out Mr. Krüger and induced him to say that he would grant everything provided the independence of the Transvaal were preserved. But Mr. Chamberlain immediately replied that the Transvaal was not an independent State, that it was a rebellious vassal, and that Great Britain could no longer tolerate its attitude of revolt. The words which the British Minister used were wilfully insulting and stinging. If the Transvaal had been able up to this time to entertain the slightest doubt as to her adversary's intentions, that doubt was now dissipated. War had become inevitable.

It was then that a revulsion of European opinion took place in favor of the Transvaal. In France especially—and America will not be surprised at that—there is a love of countries that struggle for their independence, that are ready to stake all in order to acquire or maintain it. And so the sympathies of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people went out to the brave little Republic. At the same time they were curious to know for what reasons the English Government desired and brought about a rupture, and these reasons were not found to be very edifying. It is certain that money, the thirst for material wealth, has had much to do with the sad outcome. When blood is shed for gold, when cupidity is combined with cruelty, the conscience of mankind is revolted. It is thought in Europe that the affairs of the Chartered Company were dull and on the point of becoming poor; that a crash was already threatening; that Mr. Cecil Rhodes's bold speculations were about to end in a catastrophe in which a large part of the English aristocracy would have been involved. The Chartered Company had to be saved at any cost, and the only chance of saving it was by war. That was perhaps the principal motive that brought about this decision. But there was another. For various reasons there is great discontent in the English colonies of South Africa, which, without impairing their loyalty, showed itself in the last elections by a movement which put the Afrikanders in power. Now, the Afrikanders are the friends and relatives of the Boers in the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. The same blood flows in their veins and appeals to their imaginations. By reason of its independence, the Transvaal was, as it were, the pivot about which all sorts of discontent collected. So this independence had to be crushed, and England determined to crush it, being convinced that when that task was accomplished the impatience of the Afrikanders would be checked, submission would be general, and all the dangers of the future would be averted.

It will be understood that these considerations, some of which moreover do not appear on the surface, have had a different effect on public opinion in England and in the rest of Europe. We have stated what the latter was; but between it and the conclusion that it will lead to an intervention between England and the Transvaal there is a very long step, especially when we attempt to decide what Government will be driven to intervene; indeed, the step is so long that it will not be taken. When a conflagration breaks out nowadays, the first thought of everybody is to confine and localize it—that is to say, not to interfere; and the principle of non-intervention has never been so much in favor as at this conclusion of our century. It was believed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in America during the war with Spain that there existed in Europe, or at least on the part of some of the Powers, some desire to intervene diplomatically if not by force of arms. It was stated that England had objected, and so prevented any manifestation of ill-will. This idea, which was adroitly exploited by those who might profit by it, was absolutely erroneous. The tendency to-day is to form a ring around the combatants without meddling with their quarrel, until they have had enough and themselves solicit the good offices of one or more Powers. Even in the last war between Greece and Turkey, notwithstanding the general sympathy with Greece, Europe waited patiently until Greece was beaten, and did not intervene until requested to do so. Even then Europe interfered only because she knew that Turkey was quite willing, that after having gained some glory Turkey also desired the end of a war from which no other profit was to be derived. We do not say that that was very chivalrous, but so it was; such are the new ways of countries which have all become more or less democratic and subject to military service. To bring them out of their apathy it requires some important, evident, urgent self-interest, for the Old World is now governed by selfishness far more than by generous sentiment. Now, we do not see that there is any power which is sufficiently interested, near or far, in the Anglo-Transvaal war to impose or even spontaneously to propose intervention. If France, for example, had a mind to pick a quarrel with England, or even to accept quarrels which England seemed to seek, she would have had better opportunities. We need not speak of Austria—the smallest of the great Powers from a maritime point of view, and absolutely insignificant as regards colonies; no Power could be less interested in what is going on in a continent where she does not possess an inch of territory. As for Italy, she calls herself England's friend and perhaps believes it herself, notwithstanding the absolute sterility mingled with some mortification that this friendship has brought her. She can certainly not be suspected of preparing any move that might embarrass England, or that would be regarded by the latter as anything but an entirely friendly act. There remain Russia and Germany.

Evidently Russia cannot be regarded as indifferent like Austria, or as following in the wake of Great Britain like Italy. But what interest has she in Africa? We should be tempted to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

say that she has not any if it were not inevitable for so great a Power to have some interests everywhere, either directly or indirectly. It is known, moreover, that certain common religious tendencies have awakened her traditional sympathies with Abyssinia; but they are quite platonic. In reality, Russia's entire efforts are concentrated in Asia, and it is quite true that she there encounters England at several points as an obstacle or a limit. England and Russia may, therefore, consider themselves as eventual enemies in an undetermined future which is, however, probably remote. Both have in these latter times made so many mutual concessions as to suggest that they entertain a sincere desire not to offend each other. If it were not so, we might say of Russia what we said of France, that more favorable opportunities than the present one have not been lacking; as she refrained then, she will certainly refrain now. The only secret desire she may be supposed to harbor is that England may remain occupied and in a certain measure absorbed as long as possible by the Transvaal war; but for that it is only necessary to let her alone. There is no need of any intervention. Indeed, if such intervention were successful, England would at once have her South African army disengaged for other purposes. Who can tell but she might then be tempted to use it elsewhere, either in consequence of her present warlike impulse, or because, when that impulse has been suddenly arrested at one point she might attempt to seek revenge or compensation at another. And it does not seem that Russia would be the gainer.

As for Germany, she is perhaps the country in which the unscrupulous policy of England has been condemned most vehemently. Her newspapers have distinguished themselves by the bitterness which they have mingled with their anger. But we are not now speaking of the opinions of the people—that is unanimous, as we have said—but of the attitude of the Governments. Governments can think and feel like peoples without speaking like them, and above all, without acting according to their feelings. In Germany, since the time of Kant, and even before, a great difference has always been made between pure reason and practical reason, and they are all the more apt to give themselves up to the speculations of the former the less they know how to avail themselves of the latter. For how many centuries did not Germany tend toward unity without making

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the energetic effort that would bring it to a consummation. Her thinkers and her poets wrote about it long before her men of action seriously thought of pursuing it, as Bismarck said, with fire and sword; that is to say, by the only means suitable for its accomplishment. We must not then believe that Germany is ready to act when she speaks, and only because she speaks; but judging from her history, it is perfectly permissible to believe that she does not speak in vain, but bides her time. Her true feelings toward England are not feelings of sympathy; one is often tempted to believe that they are quite the contrary, but the time has not yet come to make them the rule of her policy. In this respect William II. is the true representative of his nation. He does not like England, and she can hardly be in doubt on this point; for, whether impelled by the ardor of his temperament or the exuberance of his speech, he has not hesitated on numerous occasions to speak his mind freely. In this matter, Germany and her Emperor obey an instinct which does not deceive them. It is almost inevitable, unless the two countries are always governed by very able and very pacific statesmen, that their conflicting interests will sooner or later provoke a quarrel. The Emperor is well aware of it, and it is on this account that he insists with passionate obstinacy on the development of his navy. It is his fixed idea which continually besets him; even when he himself imagines that it has given him a respite, it suddenly springs up again in his mind and lays hold of him like a nightmare. It is well known at what cost he succeeded last year in inducing the Reichstag to adopt his naval sexennate bill. It was then generally believed, and he no doubt believed it, too, that thereafter he would need to ask for nothing more for six years; but lo, on the 18th of October last, he uttered a new note of alarm and distress at Hamburg, and once more denounced the insufficiency of his navy for sustaining the policy which would enable Germany to work out her manifest destiny. The very next day the Government papers announced that further very important and very heavy appropriations would be asked of the Reichstag to carry out a scheme of naval construction laid out not for a space of only six, but for seventeen years. Will the Reichstag grant these appropriations and once for all shackle not only its own liberty, but that of three subsequent legislatures in order to conform to the imperial plan? We do not know;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at any rate, there will be great resistance, but the Government is not without the means of overcoming it. What are we to conclude from all this, but that a Hohenzollern once more seeks to give Germany, even in spite of herself, the means of realizing her violent but vague aspirations? He for his part shares these aspirations, but in his position, with the sense of the responsibility that he would incur by hasty and inadequate execution, he sees very clearly and feels very keenly that he still lacks the means of action. So he negotiates with England on the subject of the east coast of Africa; he seeks to obtain by diplomacy what he cannot take by force; he goes to London to see his old grandmother. In short, he restrains himself, and we are quite convinced that he will continue to restrain himself and that he will not intervene in the present war.

England will therefore be allowed to fight out her quarrel with the Transvaal to the end, and the disparity of strength of the two combatants is so great that the weaker must infallibly succumb. But whatever may happen hereafter, the Transvaal will not succumb without glory. The boldness with which she declared war because she was resigned to die rather than voluntarily surrender her independence, the coolness she has shown on the battlefield, and the first successes which have demonstrated her courage—all this will be recorded to her credit in history. But she will be conquered. To make this outcome doubtful, the Afrikanders would have to rise and make common cause with the Boers. Then the situation would assume some resemblance to that which arose in America at the close of last century; but even then, if England persisted in the struggle, she would undoubtedly win. Only the war, which even now threatens to be a long one, would then be greatly protracted; it would be marked by greater atrocities; in short, the situation would long remain in suspense and the problem of the difficulties and the remedies which England has encountered in Ireland—a problem referred to by the few orators of the Liberal opposition—might easily be again realized. In that case, which we deem improbable, we should have to affix a note of interrogation to all that we have said above, and England, whose prestige would not be increased by anything that could then happen, might find embarrassments in Africa or elsewhere, although it may be impossible now to foretell how they would arise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nothing tangible therefore is likely to happen at present in consequence of the Anglo-Transvaal conflict. Public opinion will condemn the war, but the Governments will not move. None of them, as we have said, has an interest sufficiently great or direct to intervene between London and Pretoria, and the interests which some of them have outside of Africa would not be well served by intervention. Moreover, before provoking the Transvaal, England was careful to take precautions in all directions. At the close of last year, she came to an understanding on all African questions with France, and the arrangement thus made assured to the latter the continuity of her territories and satisfied her for the present. England has also had an understanding with Russia concerning the extreme East, so there is no immediate clash to be feared in that quarter. The same is true respecting Germany. In treating with that Power, England seems to have had two points in view at once—the Samoan Islands and the east coast of Africa. They had a strong desire for the Samoan Islands in Berlin, the more so because the imperial diplomacy had suffered some mortifications, the sting of which was still felt. By consenting to submit the definite situation to be established in the islands to negotiations which promised to be protracted, and which moreover could be drawn out as long as the English Government desired, it felt sure of being able to occupy and restrain the German Government by holding out a hope to which the latter attached a very great value. This hope has now been realized, and Germany has obtained her desire. She could not therefore manifest any hostile sentiments so soon afterward. There is, however, reason to believe that she regards the cession of the principal islands in the Samoan group as a mere sop and that her pretensions do not stop there. She already has considerable possessions in the east and in the west of Africa—we shall speak at present only of the former—and she has been giving her attention to the extension which the English possessions cannot fail to take in the near future in consequence of the Transvaal war. They are, in fact, destined to grow prodigiously. But a few years ago Mr. Cecil Rhodes was credited with the scheme of establishing between Northern and Southern Africa, between Egypt and the Cape an uninterrupted continuity of territory over which England exercised either paramount influence or actual sovereignty.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That scheme seemed chimerical. It is no longer regarded as unattainable at the present day, and it was natural that Germany should take it into consideration. Would she be prevented from expanding further in any direction? Nobody can tell exactly what has been agreed upon between Berlin and London, but everybody knows that something has—doubtless to the detriment of the Portuguese colonies—and it is thought also that Germany too is satisfied for the present. There may be some difficulties on this head later on, between her and England. However that may be, it is known that the latter has taken the precaution and found the means of securing a certain respite for herself during which she need fear no trouble from any quarter. There is also reason to believe that this respite will be sufficiently long for her to complete her undertaking. If she rushed into the conflict headlong in a military sense, she acted more prudently in her diplomacy, which is an additional reason for believing that she will not be disturbed by anybody in the execution of what everybody regards as an atrocity. But the opinion will prevail that an atrocity has been committed against a weak nation whose chief fault was the possession of gold mines. It will be seen once more what England is capable of when her interests are involved in the slightest degree, and how lightly she then esteems the rights of others and humanity. She speaks continually of civilization; but outside of her own boundaries nobody admits that the cause of civilization is interested in the Transvaal war. The high-sounding words with which she disguises her conduct may deceive herself, but abroad they produce a very different effect. It would have been more sincere if she had invoked only her great material interests and the right of the stronger in this affair. After all, there are other European nations in whose history sins of the same kind are found, but then they committed them in a less pharisaical, and therefore less offensive, manner. All of which is a subject for serious reflection for all the nations of the old continent, at least for all those which have a navy and colonies. The fact is that the Transvaal affair is only an episode which has a root from which others may spring. At the present time there may be observed in England the fermentation of a peculiar virus which we call Chauvinism or jingoism with which the policy of that great country is, as it were, infected. This policy has become more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and more brutal in its methods than it used to be. The generation to which Mr. Gladstone belonged is gone, and we may say the same of that to which Lord Salisbury belongs, for Lord Salisbury is no longer the master of his own party. The Liberal party and the Conservative party both obey similar influences which are well represented by Lord Rosebery and Mr. Chamberlain. New men have come into political power who not only possess insatiable ambition, but a certain hard, cold, inexorable quality as regards the means by which they would realize their ambition—a personal arrogance and a disdain of others, a cruel absence of feelings that come from the heart such as used to give evidence of their existence, even when force was used, by a certain considerateness prompted by esteem and pity. Of these not a trace is now left, and of a truth Europe would not be sorry to have Prince Bismarck back, whose soul was not too tender, if she were to fall under the hegemony of statesmen such as shine to-day in the British firmament.

These are the impressions she has received from the events of these last months. The nations feel them keenly and the Governments are not insensible to them. Each makes its own reflections on them and there are lessons that will not be lost in what is now going on. However, a part of these impressions consists in the horror which war inspires more and more as our manners grow more gentle, and hence we must not conclude that they will necessarily lead to military conflicts. Everybody desires peace, but feels at the same time that this peace may be disturbed notwithstanding this general desire by some particular opposing desire. For this reason many differences between certain nations are beginning to be minimized and at the same time new interests involving new alliances are arising. It is still only a psychological condition, but in the inevitable evolution of things, that which enters deeply into men's minds and consciences will some day produce its influence on events.

FRANCIS CHARMES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PHILOSOPHY AND MORALS OF WAR.

BY MAX NORDAU.

I.

No war has met with such general condemnation as the war in the Transvaal. In cases of the clash of arms between two nations, disinterested spectators usually divide into two groups, taking sides with one or the other of the combatants. This phenomenon does not appear to arise in this case. Outside of the Anglo-Saxon world, not a single voice has been raised for England up to the present time. The sympathies of all are on the side of the Boers. Meanwhile, the different Governments are maintaining a proper attitude, observing strict neutrality and warning their people against a too violent manifestation of feelings. But public opinion, as it finds expression in the press and in meetings, is unrestrained, and overwhelms England with execrations more emphatic even than those used in past centuries against the arch enemy of Christendom—the Turk.

Whence this unanimity of hatred against England among the people of the European continent? The sentiment has a variety of roots. Some of these lie on the surface, others are more deeply concealed. Some originate from noble motives, others from fairly ignoble ones. When David and Goliath step into the ring, brutal realists will always bet on the giant; but knightly enthusiasts will pray for the success of his diminutive opponent. The fact that a tiny people faces death without hesitation to defend its independence against an enemy fabulously superior in number, or to die in the attempt, presents an aspect of moral beauty which no soul, attuned to higher things, will disregard. Even friends and admirers of England—yea, even the English themselves—strongly sense the pathos in the situation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Dutch Boers, who feel convinced that they are fighting for their national existence, and agree that it equals the pathos of Leonidas, William Tell, and Kosciusko. With many, partisanship for the Boers rests upon genuine abstract ethical grounds. With others these nobler grounds are pretexts disguising previously existing hatred of the British. Most of the nations envy England its enormous territorial possessions in all parts of the world; its wealth, its high cultural development, its freedom; some are jealous of its competition in the world's market; one or the other of the nations reproaches it with the fact that it desires no neighbor in its colonizings, and they all regard its racial pride as an offense to their egotism.

But one fundamental note resounds through all the different cries which voice the public opinion of Europe against England—resentment because of a lost illusion.

The war in the Transvaal follows the Peace Conference at The Hague without an interval; it therefore reacts upon the mind like a cruel satire upon it. The representatives of the Powers assembled with the solemn peal of bells and sweet music, and separated with a thundering of cannon at Glencoe and Ladysmith. A thousand entranced pens celebrated the peace manifesto of the Czar as the beginning of a new era in the world's history, and these now stand convicted of the fact that the thought of turning over a new leaf is still far from Clio's mind.

The disenchantment is the more humiliating, since the illusion was sincere in the case of but very few open admirers of the initiative of the Czar. There are few general manifestations of our times in which hypocrisy played so large a part as it did in the extravagant hymns of praise that greeted the call to the conference at The Hague. The fundamental principles upon which our civilization rests, the religious doctrines, the moral and judicial standards which we pretend to follow, logically require that war should be condemned and that one should pose as a disciple of peace. No man can serve God and Mammon. It is impossible to declare: "*Justitia regnorum fundamentum*" (justice is the foundation of kingdoms) and "Might is right" at one and the same time. To be confirmed as a Christian upon a catechism which teaches: "Love thy neighbor as thyself; Thou shalt love thine enemies," and to recognize methodical preparations for murder and arson as the chief duty of every well-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ordered government, are two incompatible things. But millions of people who indulge in conventional speeches as to their love of peace, know very well that their heart does not coincide with their lips. They were grateful to the Czar, since his manifesto seemed to take their alleged love of peace for good coin of the realm, and they felt complimented therein upon the high degree of culture which it apparently assumed in them, and they are vexed with England because its actions give the lie to their assertions of their love of peace before all white humanity. An unmasked hypocrite cannot be expected to be in good humor. It scarcely wrongs the Christian Powers, if it be surmised that not one of them—not even Russia—would have acted differently from England under the same circumstances. But they would not admit it. They want to have the semblance of respect for right and neighborly love preserved. England should have allowed some little time to elapse between the Conference at The Hague and the war in the Transvaal. It might have assumed the appearance of seeking mediation or arbitration, in which case it could have adjusted matters in such a way that the attempt at a peaceful solution should have proved a failure. England has done violence to international decorum. But a breach of etiquette, this most serious of all drawing-room sins, is as unpardonable with the political hypocrite as with his social counterpart.

II.

Is it not unfounded pessimism to assume in the heart of one's neighbors murder and robbery as general sentiments? Is it not calumny to denounce white humanity as a horde of war-like barbarians lightly coated with a veneer of rational civilization?

I do not believe it is. A comparison of the factors which practically labor for peace with those which prepare, justify and train humanity for war, will show the latter as having overwhelming preponderance. The number of the apostles of peace outside of individual poets, *literati*, artists and thinkers includes a few international and national societies, whose membership is not great, comprising but few representative men of the time. Sad but true. The official organs of these societies have an incomparably smaller circulation than the most insig-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nificant financial or sporting journal, and their periodical congresses attract far less attention than a floral exhibit or a cattle show. On the other hand, all organized powers of State and society are pronounced or tacit adherents of war.

Religion is not necessarily, or at all times, an advocate of peace. That the Old Testament is filled with a warlike spirit needs no proof. Jehovah is "The Lord of Hosts" and His commands to His people more frequently involve bloodshed than compromise. The prophet Isaiah is the first to feel a premonition of a better future, when "people will beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, and nation will no longer lift up sword against nation." His God is no longer the angry God, who imposes the extermination of the Canaanites upon His people as a sacred duty. He is a loving father, who preaches: "Peace, peace—to those who are afar and to those who are near."

Christianity is indeed the religion of peace. Above the portals of the Church of Christ, the Christmas greeting of the angels, "Peace on earth and good will to men," glows as an inscription. This is theory. The practice of the Church is quite different. She has scarcely ever prevented war, and frequently pressed the sword into the hands of the faithful. In all the centuries of her sway, the Church has shed blood like water. She exterminated the Goths because of their Arianism, and she did what she could to prepare a similar fate for the Vandals and Lombards. In the Crusades she armed the Occident against the Orient, and sent hundreds of thousands, possibly millions, of pious Christians and brave Mahometans to their death. She unleashed Simon de Montfort's assassins like a pack of wolves against the Albigenses; she visited the Waldenses with fire and sword; she prepared the Night of St. Bartholomew for the Huguenots; and when she instigated neither foreign nor civil wars, she catered to the taste for the drama of human suffering and to the habit of bloodshed by the Inquisition and her Auto-da-Fes. In our day the Church has lost the power to set nation against nation, but she does not withhold her blessing from the banners of war; the hosts that march to the front are sped by her pious wishes, and she prays to God that He grant victory to the arms which she has blessed. In every country does the Church render this service to the native banners and arms, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she does not seem to see that it is blasphemy to ask of the God of Love to look with favor upon murder and destruction; or to ask of the God of the Universe to take sides with one portion of His children against another portion; especially when she knows that that other portion is turning to God with exactly the same impertinent request. Never yet has a clergyman had the common sense to say: "I refuse to pray for the victory of our arms. From the altars in the enemy's country this same prayer is rising to Heaven in this self-same hour, and to harken to both prayers, to grant victory to both hostile armies, lies beyond the pale of even God's Omnipotence." When, in the dispute over the Carolines, Prince Bismarck asked the Pope to act as arbitrator between Germany and Spain, Leo XIII. indeed declared that it was part of his office to make peace between Christian nations. But no head of a State Church has yet dared to answer the temporal authorities, who asked his blessing upon banner and host: "You desire war, and our God teaches peace. I cannot bless the hand armed to maim and kill men. If you must shed blood, do so; but do not mix God and His religion with your devil's work."

Islam does not claim to be a religion of peace. Jehad or Holy War is one of its fundamental institutions; but there is no need of stopping on this, since no one seeks the highest expression of human culture among the Mahometan peoples.

In justice, religion should not be rebuked that it does not raise a more decided voice against war. According to the religious concept, war is not so dreadful an evil as it is according to the materialistic concept. Why is war a horror? Because it inflicts misery upon men and because it destroys life. But the sufferings of war reach only the flesh, which is transitory, and what concerns the death of the body has little import for him who believes in the immortality of the soul and in the continuity of personality beyond the grave. There was no contradiction to her fundamental doctrines in the Church's maintaining that it was in the interests of religion that she instigated wars and revolutions. What is the loss of property, of bodily members, or even of life itself, in comparison with eternal salvation, which she could promise to him who fought for a good cause?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III.

The cause of peace has little to expect from the Church. She will pray and preach peace when the government of the State desires peace; and she will implore God for victory, she will bless the arms and praise death upon the battlefield to the troops as pleasing to God, when the government is carrying out a warlike policy. But religion also, which I distinguish from the Church, is not in itself an ally of peace. Whatever its ideals or theoretical dogmas may be, in practice it always savors of the opportune. It adapts itself to the attainment of the spirit of the age. It preaches words into which every nation and every individual puts the meaning corresponding to their own feelings, culture and comprehension. I do not say that religion does not gradually mold minds along the lines of its doctrines, but, on the other hand, it is likewise a fact that minds mold religion. When the Gospel was preached to Chlodwig, the King of the Franks, he had but one thought: "Ah, if I could but have been present at the crucifixion of Christ with my Franks, what havoc could I have wrought among those Romans and Jews!" In his warlike soul the religion of love aroused concepts of combat and murder only. The catechism which missionaries teach the negroes of Australia is the same from which the whites derive their knowledge of religion. No one will seriously maintain that the Australian negro fills the crystal vessel of the catechism with the same emotional and intellectual content as the white Christian. Instincts control intellect and polarize it in their own direction.

As in religion, so in the most intellectual of all intellections, Philosophy. This does not mold the feelings of men; it pleads for their intellectual authorization only; it finds reasons for them; it gives them methodical expression; it gathers them into a system. There are, of course, philosophers in every generation who strive for an objective verity and care little for the subjectivity of their contemporaries. But they are solitary dreamers, without perceptible influence upon the thought of the times. Whole nations honor as philosophers only those wise men and teachers who formulate, as reason and science, that which lives in the hearts of millions as sentiment. And since, unfortunately, the masses today still entertain violent and bloody instincts, almost all philosophers teach the justification, the necessity and even the morality and beauty of war.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the beginning of the eighteenth century Abbé de Saint Pierre created a sensation with his "*Projet de Paix Éternelle*" (Plan for Eternal Peace). The book is a landmark in a century of rationalism. Saint Pierre fails, as did the encyclopedists after him, to allow for the instinctive bases of human nature; he deals only with the visible surface, with inane forms of speech, which man bandies on his lips, when his feelings are asleep. It seemed to him a very simple and easy matter to abolish war in a Congress of all Nations, and to establish a world-police, whose duty it should be to maintain eternal peace among the peoples. One hundred and seventy years later the Czar found it a trifle less easy to realize the thought of Saint Pierre. The latter's contemporary, Voltaire, was cruelly amused with him, and demonstrated in his entertaining critique upon his book how utterly unfamiliar the good Abbé was with the realties of human nature and of life. Rousseau was a friend of peace on principle; but he considered Saint Pierre's plan as impracticable, although it was sensible, or, rather, because it was sensible—"for," he said, "men are insane; it would furthermore be a sort of insanity to be the only sane man among the insane."

The French "nationalists" of to-day, who acknowledge themselves with candid brutality, as worshippers of Force; who, with M. Jules Lemaître, adore the "Sword of Salvation," and with M. G. Hanotaux, praise the murderers of the officers Klobb, Voulet and Chanoine as heroes, have tried to introduce Kant as a crown witness for their theory. M. Brunetière tried to prove that the Koenigsberg philosopher speaks a word for war, by citing a disconnected sentence from a work later on repudiated by Kant himself. This is false. The most recent number of "Kant-Studies" shows the hardy ignorance of M. Brunetière, and the true opinion of Kant, who actually condemns war as a crime, and desires to introduce the same judiciary forms between peoples as hold between individuals. John Stuart Mill and Auguste Comte belong to the peace party among the philosophers.

On the other hand, Fichte is enthusiastic for war. And his "Speeches to the German Nation" are the chief source of the emotions which animated the German people in the wars of liberation. Hegel takes the same stand as Fichte. Since he teaches that everything that exists is rational, the logic of his own dogma compels him to find war rational, since it exists. But he goes fur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ther than that; he declares that war is not only rational, but also beautiful and useful; it is the great reconstructor of humanity; the logic of his system does not compel him to go as far as that.

About the same time Xavier de Maistre wrote his fiery hymns in praise of war, which since have become the Gospel of all scrap-politicians, and whose arguments are to be found under the pen of all militarists, polished indeed, but deteriorated, like coins that have passed through many hands.

But the greatest authority of all advocates of war is Darwin. Gladly do they accept his "struggle for existence" as the fundamental law of all life and all progress; and they conclude that war is a mandate of Nature, which man can escape as little as he can the law of gravitation. I will not here discuss Darwin's theory. Neither need I show that, according to Darwin's concept, combat may assume moral and lovable forms; as in cases where the individuals of a species do not battle against one another, but turn against other species in loyal solidarity; or, in higher degrees of mental culture, against the inimical forces of nature; or, when the male bird woos the female and tries to outdo his rival by a more graceful dance-step, more beautiful song or a richer ornamentation of feathers. In such combats no blood is shed, no life is destroyed. They develop the best qualities of the combatants, and at best produce some slight distress in the egotism of the conquered. In this way, however, the pseudo-Darwinian philosophers and politicians do not understand the "struggle for existence." They always impart to the word of Darwin the sense of the prize-fighter and the gladiator and subject the history of mankind to the law of the jungle. As Christians, as citizens of communities theoretically based upon right, they felt hitherto that a sense of decorous duty impelled them to simulate a love of peace and to weep a few crocodile tears over war as a necessary evil. But since the theory of evolution has been promulgated, they can cover their natural barbarism with the name of Darwin and proclaim the sanguinary instincts of their inmost hearts as the last word of science.

Only this faintly veiled foundation of savagery can explain the fact that the ravings of Nietzsche, an insane man, suffering with psychic paresis, which finally paralyzed the enfeebled brain entirely, could be enthroned as the philosophy of fashion. Nietzsche thinks that he is an opponent of Darwin, but, in real-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ity, his work is but a parody on Darwin's theory misunderstood. And this by reason of grotesque exaggerations. "The Over-Man" —"the free-roving blond beast"—"all is allowable"—"the laughing lion"—"on the other side of good and evil"—"the morals of the classes"—these prison formulae, these shibboleths of brigandage harmonized too well with the most secret sentiments of the red-skins in dresscoat and uniform, wherewith alleged white humanity teems, not to be greeted by them with joy as the highest form of revelation.

IV.

It seems to me that the cause of peace is not being defended with proper arguments on right ground. Mr. Herbert Spencer regards the history of civilization as an evolution from war to industrialism and uses these two conditions as antitheses. They are not necessarily such. War is not abrogated by resting the entire existence of a people upon commerce and trade. If industrialism is really to mean the end of war, an equality of evolution must exist between all peoples who have reached the industrial phase of civilization. But, within the limits of calculable time, this is a greater Utopia than eternal peace through general altruism. As long as there are Free-Trade and Protection States, advanced and retarded nations, industry is also open to the temptation to handle tools and swords alternately, and to open markets, which threaten to close, or are monopolized by rivals, by force. Thus industrialism, in the present condition of things, may become a cause of war, instead of a guarantee against it. Herr Johann von Bloch, the Russian State-Councillor, recently brought into prominence through the Conference at The Hague, has, in his gigantic work of six volumes, "War," tried to prove by a multitude of figures that war is impossible to-day between the Great Powers. I fear that facts would easily convince Herr von Bloch that he errs. Where there is a will there is a way. The horrors of war are the same for both contestants, and he who enters upon the combat with the greater assurance and with the more intense craving for victory, will bear them longer than his more timid opponent. It is this ability to "bear longer" that constitutes him the victor.

One argument is on the tongue of all defenders of peace; it is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sentimental argument. It seems to be the strongest, but in reality it is the weakest. It appeals to our sympathies with reference to the manifold sufferings which war entails upon humanity; but it facilitates the answer for the advocates of war.

The spectacle of a corpse with yawning wounds or of a heap of maimed dead is horrible. It is heart-rending to see mothers weeping for their sons, wives for their husbands—for the bread-winners of their children. But are these spectacles produced by war alone? The sociologist, who overlooks broad fields of national life from a high standpoint, will answer that war is but one of many evils which cloud human existence; and by no means the worst, although the most melodramatic. As a moral phenomenon war is a crime. As a material phenomenon it by no means plays the part in ethnic and social economy which one would suppose *prima facie* before the first impression has been mathematically controlled by means of statistics.

War destroys many human lives. It is true. Yet not so many that the rate of mortality is perceptibly influenced thereby. In 1870-71 the German army lost, in round numbers, 40,000 men, killed in battle and by disease. At that time the rate of mortality in Germany was 27 in 1,000, or, with a population of 41,000,000, in round numbers, it was 1,107,000 per year. The 40,000 fatalities of the war increased this number about 3.6 per cent. and raised the mortality less than 1 in 1,000. The French losses were greater. They amounted to 88,000 men. But the epidemic of influenza in 1890 increased the rate of mortality in France to a greater extent than the war, although the war was one of the most sanguinary of the century. Typhoid fever has claimed more victims than all wars; and shipwrecks do not rank far below it. But typhoid fever could assuredly be prevented more easily than war, by a little concerted caution, and it is probable that a large number of shipwrecks could be traced to other causes than the irresistible forces of the elements.

War brings suffering upon the people—assuredly. But these sufferings are more rare and less painful than those which every great strike, every important lockout, every loss of labor, in consequence of commercial stagnation, carries in its train. In the sections of our great industrial centres inhabited by the proletariat more continuous misery exists than in camps or villages visited by war. The coal miner is exposed to greater dangers than the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

soldier in the field. The stoker on the steamer of a tropical line suffers more intolerable bodily discomfort than the soldier on the most dreadful day of battle, and receives less moral and material compensation. The cynic might say that these hysterical lamentations are raised about war because its devastation strikes all, even the upper, strata of society; while the denunciation of other causes of sickness, pain and death is neglected, because their devastations are confined to the lower layers of the people.

The sentimental argument, therefore, will not down the advocates of war, for they defend themselves readily with ethnic data and statistics.

The emotion which sustains the warlike tendencies of cultured men is stronger than religion, which preaches love to one's neighbor; stronger than philosophy, which teaches the irrationality of brute force; stronger than morals and right, which civilized man pretends to recognize as the leading powers of his life. This feeling is ruthless egotism, which lusts merely for self-gratification, and remains untouched by the concept that the neighbor also has rights which deserve respect. All the culture of to-day is calculated to strengthen this egotism, not to weaken it. Art, poetry and fiction exalt the individual. Their ideal is "sovereign personality," which knows neither self-control nor duty toward the neighbor. This "sovereign personality," which is praised as the most perfect blossom of human development, is the worst enemy of all moral advance. Anarchism, the war of the classes with the masses, political and economical rings, patriotism which swells into Chauvinism and national megalomania, are but different aspects of this delirium of self-love.

If war is to disappear from national life, the individual must first feel his solidarity with the race in his heart, and not only recognize it as mere verbal wisdom; and the law of progress must be co-operation instead of competition. But in such a world-concept, which recognizes the individual only as a social being, as a civic entity (*Zoon politikon*) and imposes upon his subjectivity the law of the collective organism, the egotism of "sovereign personality" can scarcely find room.

MAX NORDAU.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOUTH AFRICAN QUESTION.

BY ANDREW CARNEGIE.

In considering this question we must push aside as irrelevant the reason given for the recent demand upon the Transvaal. This, it will be remembered, was the wrongs of the foreigners there. The negotiation started with the presentation of a petition, ostensibly signed by these Uitlanders, imploring the Queen to consider their "wrongs" and to obtain redress. The British Government called the attention of its High Commissioner to this request and asked him to confer with the Transvaal Government. This resulted in a conference. The main demand made by the British Agent was for a shorter residence for these foreigners to render them eligible for the franchise. Britain wished five years' residence; the Transvaal proposed seven. The difference not being great, it was generally supposed that subsequent negotiations would result in a compromise and all would be well. Subsequently, five years was offered by President Krüger, under conditions which the British Agent at Pretoria, Mr. Greene, stated he thought his Government would accept, and which, Mr. Chamberlain admitted, conceded nine-tenths of British demands.

This franchise demand was very soon seen to be a flimsy foundation for Britain to rest action upon, because it placed her in the attitude of laboring for increased facilities for her own subjects to denationalize themselves and become subjects of the Transvaal. The public in Great Britain, however, did not see for a time that the Uitlanders' wrongs were merely an excuse for raising the real issue. The London *Times*, however, from near the very beginning, and continually as the negotiations proceeded, did not fail to state that this whole business of franchise for Uitlanders did not reach the problem, which was, in short, whether the British or the Dutch were to control South Africa.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Morley and Sir Edward Clarke demonstrated that "the suzerainty" of Britain was abolished by the existing convention, the *Times* boldly replied that this was a matter not at all depending upon such subtle legal considerations, and stood, as before stated, upon the broad issue, Briton *versus* Boer. In this the *Times* was quite right; such is the issue and none other. Nor is it a new one. It was the issue in the last war between Britain and the Transvaal, in which the former was worsted, and there is no other issue in this war.

It is the fashion to-day to censure Mr. Gladstone's decision to end the last Transvaal war, and concede to the Boer, as the practical fruits of victory, the independence of the Republic. A party in Britain held then, as it holds now, that the war should have been continued, "Majuba Hill" avenged and British ascendency then firmly established. Mr. Gladstone's critics to-day describe him as having acted under the influence of sentiment as opposed to practical politics and giving way to the *natural* dislike of a great empire to push matters to extremes against a few Boers. In this the writer thinks they do Mr. Gladstone grave injustice as a statesman. Much to this great man's credit, he was more open to the charge of magnanimous treatment of other nations than most British statesmen; but Mr. Gladstone had the advice of the ablest men conversant with the situation in South Africa, when he decided that force, in this case, was no remedy; that far-seeing statesmanship required that the Dutch element be conciliated, not destroyed, if it were ever to be amicably merged into the British. There have always been two parties advising different courses in regard to this serious question. There were two in Mr. Gladstone's time and there are two to-day—one urging peace, the other war.

The situation may be thus described: The Dutch settled in the Cape nearly 250 years ago, and were the dominant power. Britain subsequently took the Cape as a harbor on the route to India, and has remained in power. The Dutch race has settled there, is to-day increasing rapidly and has made South Africa its home. Sufficient time has elapsed for successive generations of the Dutch strain to be reared there, who now call themselves "Afrikanders" and have a strong league, the soul of which is the idea that Africa belongs to the Afrikanders—to those who were born there, whether British or Dutch.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain is too prosperous at home to furnish many emigrants in our day to any foreign lands. The few who do leave Britain usually prefer Canada or the United States, those who land in the former generally gravitating to the more genial south. In the Cape Colony, the principal of the four divisions of South Africa, the Dutch are largely in the majority, which is the case also in the Orange Free State. In Natal there are only a few thousand British. In the Transvaal there were scarcely any people but the Dutch, until the discovery of the mines, which have attracted foreigners from all nations, until to-day, by counting all foreigners as British, there may be a small majority against the Dutch; but these are not all British; some estimate that there are not more than six thousand Britons among the miners. Those of other nationalities do not side with the British as against the Dutch. The vast majority of these, as well as of the British, are opposed to the present attack upon the Transvaal. Of this there can be no doubt. These people are working in the mines, receiving enormous wages, and only wish to be let alone. They do not wish to become Burghers in order to vote; especially is this true of the British. I have peculiar means of knowing this. Several of the tenants upon my Skibo estates have sons or brothers in the mines, and I have from time to time been informed of the letters which they write home. There is one now in charge of an important mine whose letters are most significant. He stated to his father, in one of these, what I have already said, and that the Britons liked the Boers, and did not wish to become Burghers. They were there as Britons to make money, and finally to return to their own home. They wanted no franchise. He stated that the petition to Her Majesty praying her to interfere was not generally signed by the Britons, and that many of the foreigners signed the petition believing that it had reference to some dreaded temperance legislation in which they were deeply concerned.

I have also met Transvaal students who attend the Edinburgh medical schools. One of these was born in Britain, and his parents took him when young to Cape Colony. His father is a judge. Another, who was born in the Cape of English parents, is the son of a member of the Cape Assembly. These young men have since returned to their homes to fight for the coming "South African Republic," which they expect, and which shall be independent of all foreign powers, Britain included.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, the question which presented itself to Mr. Gladstone in the last war presented itself to-day to the present Government of Britain, and there were not wanting now, as there were not wanting then, some of the ablest and most experienced British officials who counselled the pursuance of the policy which Mr. Gladstone had adopted. They reason thus: "We, the British, are in a minority in South Africa, which is becoming greater and greater year by year, as the Dutch residents multiply, and we receive but few of our own countrymen as settlers, most of those who do come being only temporary residents, looking forward always to the arrival of the day when they have secured enough upon which to return to their own home. The home of the Dutch in the Cape is Africa. Our true policy now, the only policy open to us, which promises a chance of our becoming and remaining the paramount power, is one of co-operation and of friendliness with the more numerous and constantly increasing Dutch. We must trust to the superior qualities of our race, peaceably exercised, to its ability to rise to the top and to control affairs, and to the merging of the two races into the coming South African, the product of a union of Dutch and British."

The late Commander-in-Chief of the British forces at the Cape, General Butler, was, and is still, esteemed by many as a wise Governor, but he differed from the present Government as to the true policy, and he was called home. The British Agent at Pretoria, Mr. Greene, assured the Transvaal Government that he believed the proposal they made would be acceptable to his Government. It is no secret that Mr. Greene's policy was not that of Mr. Chamberlain, although while Mr. Greene remains in the diplomatic service there can be no expression of the difference of his views. Neither can General Butler enter into public controversy with his Government. These are servants of the Government and must be silent, although disgraced.

The policy now adopted is that of forcing the issue, raising a racial war and suppressing Dutch aspirations. This policy was attractive when it was believed that the mere decision to send a full army corps of thirty-five thousand men to supplement the British forces in South Africa would so appall the Dutch element that it would never raise a finger in the face of such tremendous forces against them, feeling that it would be madness to do so. This was the belief prevalent in England. It was reported that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new General-in-Chief assured Her Majesty when he took his departure that the British flag would wave over Pretoria by Christmas.

Warnings were not wanting that the conflict might not be restricted to the Transvaal Republic if the race issue were the cry, and that the Orange Free State Republic, which is Dutch to the core, might join forces with her neighbor, that thousands of fighting men from the Cape Colony, also overwhelmingly Dutch, might flock to the Dutch standard, were the race question pressed home.

The war party took no heed of such dangers, and the able Britons who, knowing the situation, saw these possibilities were only rebuked for their baseless fears.

It was believed by most that it would be a mere parade to the Boer capital. Attention was everywhere called to the fact that no such stupendous force ever left the shores of England. This was not the opinion of the party who counselled the continuance of Mr. Gladstone's pacific policy. These, as it has since been proved, knew the situation. What they feared has come to pass. To-day a second army corps of thirty-five thousand men is already found necessary, and is soon to sail, Britain thus denuding herself of proper reserves and laying London open, as a French critic has recently said, to an attack by a few thousand men.

It is not to be a parade as expected; quite the reverse. This racial dispute promises to prove as severe a strain upon Britain as the Crimean war, and Lord Salisbury's successor may say of it, as he has recently said of that war, that it was "one in which Britain put its money upon the wrong horse." That the resources of Britain, if fully drawn upon, can ultimately overpower the Dutch temporarily need not be questioned, but whether the end attained can justify the sacrifice seems open to question.

It does not appear to the writer that it can possibly do so, because the suppression of the Dutch element to-day, if such be the result, will accomplish nothing permanent, if the situation is to remain as before described and the Dutch are to remain in South Africa as residents and increase rapidly, being a very prolific race, and the British are not to emigrate to South Africa in great numbers, and also settle there and increase. The result must inevitably be that the Dutch will be in a majority, growing constantly greater. Even more important than this is the fact that the people born

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Africa must more and more desire to rule themselves. It will be found very hard to drive out of the mind of an Afrikander, whether of British or Dutch extraction, the idea that the country belongs to those who are born in it. The native-born must inevitably draw together and become one race, firm against any foreign race.

Should Britain endeavor to hold sway in South Africa through free institutions—such government, for instance, as Canada and Australia have—then the Parliament becomes Afrikander, as that of Cape Colony now is, as the Parliament of Canada is Canadian and the Parliament of Australia Australian—with the difference that in Canada and Australia the people have no cause to be opposed to Britain and there is no racial question involved. People living in Canada and Australia have not been crushed by a foreign power of different race from beyond the sea, which assumes to dominate them. Besides this, Britain disclaims all wish to hold either Canada or Australia against its will; for its protectorate over Canada and Australia it has the indisputable requirement, the consent of the governed. It is there by the wish of all sections of the inhabitants.

The war party made much of President Krüger's so-called ultimatum, but the wonder is not that this was issued, but that it was so long delayed. War was practically declared when Britain began the movement of large bodies of troops toward the borders of the Orange Free State, and to points which hemmed the Transvaal in. An English military critic said before the ultimatum came that for the Transvaal to allow these masses of soldiers to press closer daily would be military insanity. The British continued to mass troops, confident that the Transvaal authorities would never take up the challenge. When they did so the British forces were still unprepared.

The right of Britain to attack the Dutch simply because they were rapidly increasing in South Africa and promised soon under free institutions to regain their lost control, need not be considered. If the real issue be Briton *versus* Dutch, as it is admitted now to be by Britain, she stands condemned before the civilized world. Her conduct is indefensible and her policy foolish. No nation has a right to attack and endeavor to suppress a people so capable of self-government as the Dutch and force its own supremacy, although in a minority. So much for the moral

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question. And as for the policy, the attempt must ultimately fail; for, sooner or later, the more numerous race will prevail. Hence the folly of departing from Mr. Gladstone's course.

It does not seem to the writer that to plunge South Africa into a racial war, in an endeavor to suppress the Dutch, is the best and surest way to insure the peaceful and satisfactory paramountcy of Britain. On the contrary, he believes that Mr. Gladstone was well advised years ago to adopt the policy of peaceful co-operation; that Lord Salisbury was equally well advised recently by able servants of the Crown in South Africa to continue Mr. Gladstone's wise course and avoid raising the dangerous racial issue.

It is probable that Britain will have good reason, before the contest ends, and even after it ends in a supposed victory, to ponder Shakespeare's words:

> "When force and gentleness play for a kingdom,
> The gentle gamester will the sooner win."

ANDREW CARNEGIE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A POSSIBLE CONTINENTAL ALLIANCE AGAINST ENGLAND.

BY DEMETRIUS C. BOULGER.

No Englishman can have resided on the continent of Europe during the last two years, as I have done, with some special opportunities of watching the trend of political events, without becoming aware of a remarkable anti-English movement, which I may call a consolidation of Continental opinion against Anglo-Saxon expansion. It began before the United States went to war with Spain, but rather in a debating-society mood than with the serious purpose of responsible statesmen. The American public do not need to be told that the sentiment of every Foreign Office and of every nation on the mainland of Europe was against them in their contest with Spain. They also know very well that the one substantial fact which made irate potentates and irritated crowds on that continent pause before turning their sentiments into action was the presence and the power of the British fleet. The United States completed their business amid the frenzied exclamations of Continental journalists on behalf of "the innocent" and "unoffending" Spaniards. But America is far off, and when the war closed the venom and the fear of Continental Governments and nations became concentrated on Great Britain. Additional force was given to these feelings by the knowledge of the part taken by the British Government in lending its moral support to the United States, by the spectacle of the British and American peoples arriving at spontaneous agreement as to their identical interests and common mission, and by the inevitable consequence of those circumstances in the conclusion that the growth of Anglo-Saxon power, instead of being arrested, was on the point of taking a fresh and remarkable expansion.

How long these feelings might have remained in the chrysalis

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stage of suppressed resentment and secret intention, if there had been no war in the Transvaal, is uncertain; but, at the present moment, the floodgates of Continental eloquence and wrath are let loose for the denunciation of England. All that was said to the discredit of the American people during the Spanish war has been written of England's action in South Africa with intensified vindictiveness and an enlarged vocabulary. It is not a question merely of the rights or wrongs of the Uitlander population being ignored and thrust aside without a moment's consideration, nor is it one as to whether some compromise might not have been discovered in the Transvaal, short of the stern arbitrament of war. A friend might hold an opinion contrary to ours without offending us or giving us the right to complain. We could make allowance for some defect in his knowledge of the facts, we should admit that his point of view was not ours. But there is all the difference in the world between the protest of a friend and the snarling of a foe. Our Continental critics leave us in no doubt as to their sentiments. They use the loftiest language, they invoke the ideal principles, they speak in the name of sublime justice, whenever they have to comment on British action; but they forget to exact from the opposing side an equal compliance with these non-terrestrial conditions, and they fail to observe them themselves when they are called on to deal with colonial problems and difficulties. The Boers may play the tyrant on the veldt without a word of censure. In their truculent intolerance they might insult the British army and drag its flag in the dirt, and the boulevard loungers would only be amused. But France may repress, as the savage disposition of some of her officers may dictate, tribes fighting for their independence in the Soudan or in Madagascar; Russia may make an example of the inhabitants of Tashkent, when they show an inclination to dispute her authority; Germany can ride rough-shod, in her characteristic official manner, over her subjects in the Cameroons; all these things may be done with impunity, while England is howled at for vindicating her authority and for punishing those who have reviled at and defied her. Only in her case does the Continental critic adopt his severest mood, take down his book of homilies, and after the most edifying admonition condemn her to the public pillory among the nations, and—what is more congenial to their mood and nearer to their practical purpose—to the dis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comfiture and overthrow an all-powerful Deity will mete out for such iniquity. Our Continental critics and enemies who arrogate to themselves, under an appropriated decree of Providence imagined in their own conceit, the position of judge, jury and court of appeal in one, evolve out of their own rhetoric the arrest and downfall of Anglo-Saxon supremacy.

These expressions of violent prejudice and unreasoning wrath are merely the froth on the surface of the waters of public opinion. But, in the depths, there is a serious movement, a profound agitation, not to be ignored, threatening serious disturbance when it acquires the necessary volume, and calling for careful and timely examination. The questions that require consideration are not limited to the one raised in the title of this paper. They are not confined to the possibility or probability of a general Continental alliance against England. A far graver danger is threatened by the general hostility of all the Powers, which, moving on their own independent lines, are yet inspired by the common sentiment that England's further expansion must be stopped. That opinion is common to them all in different degrees of intensity, and when people are agreed in their views it is certain that they will do nothing to hinder their realization, although they may not openly combine for the purpose. I hope to make it clear, before the end of this paper, that the peril of England in this latter form already exists, and that England has begun, unconsciously, a struggle in which the whole of Europe is arrayed against her; that the struggle will pass through several distinct episodes or chapters; and that the result will decide the fate of the British Empire. In studying so momentous a problem, the most exalted persons are merely pieces on the chessboard. They are not entitled to any greater consideration than their inherent value and position on the table may give them, in deciding the course and the issue of the game. It would be absurd to discuss the question at all if we were obliged to consider the personal susceptibilities of an Emperor, to gloss over the rottenness of an administration, or to ignore the decadence of a nation.

Prince Bismarck said in 1885 that England had got enough of the world's surface. It was a moment of profound national depression and humiliation. Mr. Gladstone was in office. Majuba Hill was recent. The ineffaceable tragedy and disgrace of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Khartoum had just happened. The Berlin Conference was summoned. What occurred? In the centre of Africa was formed a great independent and neutral State, on the west and also on the east coast Germany acquired vast territories, while France came down to the Congo and its tributaries. In this manner barriers were placed in the path of further British expansion in Africa. To appreciate the full significance of that rebuff it must, however, be remembered that England had to cancel her own Convention with Portugal on the subject of the Congo, and to assent to her vassal, the Sultan of Zanzibar, being stripped of his possessions on the mainland, for the benefit of Germany.

The ten years that followed the Berlin Conference were, for England, a period of meditation on the errors of the years from 1881 to 1885, and for attaining collectedness as to how they might be repaired. With regard to the Soudan, the country gradually adopted General Gordon's weighty conclusion, that it "could not be divorced from Egypt." Hence followed the gradual reconquest of the country by Lord Kitchener, who destroyed the military power of the Khalifa at the Atbara and Omdurman. The retrieval of that part of the Gladstone legacy of national loss and discredit was almost accompanied by a war with France over the incident at Fashoda, where a French officer, with the permission of M. Hanotaux, notwithstanding the repeated warnings of our Foreign Office, erected the tricolor. The incident ended with the establishment of British predominance throughout the Nile Valley, but the French people have decided to cherish the name of Fashoda as constituting for them a humiliation, and to use it as a war cry when they close the doors of their Exhibition.

The delay of ten years in commencing the reconquest of the Soudan did not make the task appreciably more difficult, for the dervishes were isolated, and the clever scheme formed by Russia and France to make our task more troublesome by inciting and assisting Abyssinia to join the Khalifa, or at least to attack us, was not allowed sufficient time to mature or come off. But the nineteen years that have elapsed since Majuba have served to enlarge a local question of comparatively little importance into a problem of the first magnitude, affecting the general international position, and influencing more or less the attitude of the Continental Powers toward England. There is no more uncertainty as to the persons who have created for us this aggrava-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of difficulty in South Africa than there was about the intrigues in Abyssinia and on the Upper Nile. Germany, and, above all Germans, the German Emperor, is just as responsible for President Krüger's defiance as France and M. Hanotaux were for Marchand's appearance at Fashoda, and for the hostile intentions of M. de Bonchamps and Henry of Orleans at the court of King Menelek. But they are responsible for a great deal more. Their encouragement, advice and practical assistance, in the form of officers, drill sergeants, artillerymen and arms, have made the Boers a formidable military opponent, only to be crushed by the loss of many brave lives and by an extraordinary effort. In South Africa, as in the Soudan, British supremacy will be reasserted; but it is impossible to ignore the quarter whence the Boers received inspiration, not merely as to their line of policy, but as to their strategy in the field, which might well have gained for the Boers some military successes at the beginning of the war.

Without an alliance, therefore, it is clear that for a number of years France, Germany and Russia have been pursuing an anti-English policy, opposing our plans, raising difficulties in our path, and diminishing by extensive colorings of the map the area left vacant for the introduction of our commerce and civilization. There is no reason to suppose that these measures have been carried out on any systematic plan, but they certainly indicate the prevalence of a general anti-English sentiment, such as Prince Bismarck crystallized in the phrases, "England had got enough of the world's surface," and "It might not be Germany's interest to take any specific colony, but it certainly was her interest to prevent England getting it." These sentences were not appreciated at the time, but a little reflection will show how the ideas they expressed have influenced foreign policy during the last fourteen or fifteen years. But in no part of the world—for the time is not yet ripe for treating China after the fashion of Africa in 1885—has the effort been greater to create for England a situation of danger and embarrassment than in South Africa. When the first campaigns with the Boers were undertaken no outsiders were interested in the question. Not a gold mine had been worked, hardly one Uitlander could be discovered on the veldt. But the stubbornness and success of the Boer resistance in 1881 aroused some interest in them, and that interest has

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certainly not diminished by the extraordinary gold discoveries and the consequent inrush of European adventurers and settlers, chiefly British, but with a very considerable number of Germans, Dutch and Cape Dutch, all of whom gradually adopted, as comprehensive names, those of Hollanders in the Transvaal and Afrikanders in the Cape Colony. In this way was created a party, not confined to the Transvaal, but extending its organization and influence throughout South Africa, distinct from and opposed to the British settlers and Government. The strength and cohesion of that party were insured by the use of their common language, and thus, for the first time, German and its offshoots entered the lists as a rival to English, on the ground of colonial dominion.

But if the project was not restricted to the Transvaal, it was thence that it derived its chief solidity and resources. The gold of its mines, applied to the purchase of warlike stores and to the employment of German and other officers and ex-soldiers, gave it a military power far in excess of the number or general knowledge of the inhabitants. The love of independence shown throughout Boer history, and the prestige acquired by the successes in 1881, made the Transvaal the natural leader in a Teutonic movement throughout South Africa. But not merely is the Transvaal to be regarded, in the development of the question, as a free agent acting for and on its own behalf. If it had not possessed another rôle—if, in plainer words, it had stood alone—the decisive interference in its affairs might have been put off till the disappearance of Mr. Krüger in the ordinary course of nature should have given a chance for more enlightened and saner counsels. But the Transvaal was the *imperium in imperio* which supplied our enemies with the means of organizing, within our limits, a formidable confederacy that, at the given moment of external complications, might have revealed all its power and ambition, to the serious peril and perhaps temporary disappearance of British supremacy south of the Tropic of Capricorn. Before the Jameson raid, it was well known how active German agents had grown in the Transvaal, and in the four years since that episode their activity has increased and grown more systematic and dangerous. Under these circumstances, it would have been madness to defer action any longer. The German Emperor's telegram of congratulation and support to President Krüger in 1896 was the indiscreet lifting of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

veil as to all Germany had done and intended still to do in the Transvaal.

Four years have passed since that telegram, and we are now assured that the German Emperor has purged him of his offense, and that the British plans will encounter no opposition at his hands. Before these lines can appear in print, he should have visited England, and many opinions will be hazarded as to the true significance of that perhaps farewell interview between grandmother and grandson. But even if the visit comes off, it will perhaps not enable us to see very much more clearly, or a great deal further ahead, as to the true intentions of Germany. The affectionate and confidential utterances of royal personages will not arrest the course of State policy, nor turn aside from their purpose statesmen and diplomatists whose efforts and reputation are staked on the arrest of Anglo-Saxon expansion. Any new agreement with Germany will be like that already signed, but unpublished, of which the one thing certainly known is that it *did not* give us Delagoa Bay, when its possession would have enabled us to take the Boers in flank and at a great disadvantage; or, perhaps, it will more resemble the unsigned agreement with Mr. Rhodes at Berlin, which will create German railways, without carrying us much on the road for the Cape to Cairo railway. The German Emperor has left both England and America in no sort of doubt as to his views, wishes and plans in regard to their affairs. He is their enemy, but their waiting enemy, because his fleet is in its infancy, "a mere baby," to use his own words; but it seems to have escaped the notice of his critics that babies, especially such a fine healthy baby as the German navy of to-day, become men.

These preliminary observations, necessary for the correct appreciation of what follows, may have made clear one thing, viz.: the hostile intentions, toward England in the first place and the United States in the second, of the three leading military Powers, France, Germany and Russia. With regard to Russia, it need only at this stage be observed that she has open to her in Asia a wide field for ambitious operations, that occupy her attention and render her less keen than the others to interfere with Great Britain in quarters with which she has little or no concern. It may be said of her at once that, if she were induced to interfere with England over any African question, it would be not of her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own free will, but under the pressure of France. The crippling of England in any quarter might bring the Cossacks nearer to the Indus or Peking, but the secret of Russia's success hitherto has been the concentration of her policy, and she may prefer to attain her objects in her own way and without seeking remote adventures. With the exception of the Abyssinian scheme, Russia has as yet shown no inclination to come into collision with England outside of Asia. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that, whatever St. Petersburg may do in support of others, the initiative of any offensive measure against England in Africa will be at Paris or Berlin. In both those capitals there has for many years been a systematic plan of embarrassing and thwarting England in Africa. The French designs were brought to a summary check at Fashoda, but the German have continued down to the present hour under a friendly guise.

But there is a radical difference between hostile intentions and a definite alliance. All the Continental nations may dislike and envy us; but they have their own relations and differences to consider. Europe is an armed camp from the Channel to the Caspian; but the explanation of that fact is not the wish to make war on England, but the need of defending their several frontiers against one another. The practical questions are: Can the Powers lay aside, even momentarily, their mutual jealousies and apprehensions, to combine against England? Do statesmen at Berlin seriously contemplate a union with Paris and St. Petersburg, in order to call a halt on the British in South Africa? Can they afford to face the consequences of the success of a policy in which they would be following the lead of France and Russia? Can they feel confident that the policy would succeed, either by England's yielding to a formidable international demonstration, or by the Powers vanquishing England on the sea? We may be sure, at least, that the German Government will carefully consider these points in all their bearings before they come to the momentous decision to quarrel with England. They will be swayed very much by their estimate of the relative strength of the Continental Powers and the British Empire. They will carefully examine, by the light of the information they possess, the condition of the allies who are only waiting their signal to present England with an ultimatum which, if signed by Germany, would make her for good and forever an enemy. If that step

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would isolate England to-day, Germany at no remote date might find herself in the same position, and exposed on both her frontiers to the double peril of Slav ambition and French revenge.

The material and political condition of European countries may also appear discouraging under the close and critical examination of German spectacles. Germany is allied with two tottery States in Austria and Italy, in both of which exist serious elements of internal dissension and weakness, that might greatly diminish their value at the critical moment when Germany had need of them. With regard to any possible action against England, Austria would not count at all, and Italy is the one European Power that would certainly not take part against her, because the co-operation of the British Navy is needed, and assured by a definite understanding, for the protection of her own coasts. Spain does not seriously exist, and the sentiment of little States like Holland and Belgium, however noisily uttered, can have no influence on the question. The continent of Europe, therefore, resolves itself, for practical purposes, into the three Powers, Germany, France and Russia; and when the possibility of an alliance between those three rival Powers is suggested, one realizes the exact difficulties that lie in the path of those who would effect it.

Russia and France being already allies for better or worse, the practical point to be discovered is whether there is any reasonable probability of Germany's associating herself with them for the arrest of England's progress, and, if need were, for her more serious discomfiture. There was a time when the mere proposition would have been received with ridicule, and when an equal repugnance to the suggestion would have been shown at both Berlin and Paris. But as much cannot be said to-day. The alliance may be impracticable, but at least it excites no repugnance. The idea of such a combination has sunk into the minds of both peoples, and it will at least afford abundant material for discussion. Nor can it be forgotten that such an alliance existed, for all practical purposes, at the Berlin Conference of 1885, and still more openly in 1895, when the three Powers arrested Japan's progress and ignored England. The old theory that France and Germany could and would never combine requires at least more careful examination before passing current than formerly. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may still be sound, but it has not such a sure foundation as it once had. France is undoubtedly willing to sink her ancient feud with Germany, in order to gratify her more pressing irritation against England. The German Emperor has but to give a nod and he can fold the French Republic, Cap of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity and all, with the French army to boot, in his arms. If Germany had only to think of theatrical effect, the inclination to make the sign would be irresistible, but she must look a little further ahead and think what will come after.

It is not going too far to say that France has offered Germany her alliance against England, with the object of stopping her conquest of the two South African Republics. Of course, France has not put herself in the position of inviting a formal rebuff, but at Berlin they are in no doubt as to what France is willing to do, and also as to what France wishes Germany to do. The visit of the German Emperor to Windsor is regarded as the cold-water douche to these indirect overtures, but it may not have all the significance or importance imagined. Still, it means that Germany is not as eager as she was supposed to be to enter the lists against England. She has reckoned up the odds, and she has come to the conclusion that the fleets of the three Powers would not be certain to have the better of the English fleet, which could count on the co-operation of Japan at once, and probably of Italy as well, with the possible intervention of the United States on the same side following, perhaps, at a short interval. The paper odds of the German-French-Russian fleets against England would thus be turned into the material and incontestable superiority of England and her allies, when the nations vanquished would certainly lose their navies and their colonies. From inviting that catastrophe the Emperor William has drawn back, and just in time. Four years ago he went very near to the edge of the precipice; but, after some irritation and resentment, he seems to have placed upon himself a prudent restraint which the excited exhortations of the German Colonial Party are not likely to break down.

His policy is not dictated by any sincerely friendly feeling toward England, but by a careful regard for German interests. Perhaps the occasion will arise, before the Transvaal difficulty is settled, for him to show how very little he cares about England and her interests, although he is not disposed to enter the field

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

openly against her. If, for instance, as is by no means improbable, France and Russia take steps which assail our rights in some quarter, and provoke a war for which England was never more ready than at the present hour, Germany would stand aside and observe the strictest neutrality. She would not move a finger to help us, and would take a cynical satisfaction in seeing her formidable military neighbors injure themselves; and, at the same time, the damage that could not fail also to be inflicted by such a war on England would facilitate the Emperor's schemes for the commercial and colonial expansion of his own country. Moreover, the German Emperor and Government will expect to be paid for this neutrality, whether there is war or peace, by concessions in Africa or the Pacific; and, as the Germans are good hands at driving a bargain—the title of "honest broker" was not gained by Bismarck without reason—the highest value will be set on their services in order to gain the largest amount of reward. Provided there is no general outbreak of war and Great Britain is left undisturbed to establish firmly and indisputably her supremacy in the Transvaal and Orange Free States, no Englishman could object to see Germany come down to the Zambesi, when Portugal quits the East Coast, with Walfisch Bay on the West Coast thrown in. But if war ensues with France and Russia, then Germany should receive nothing unless she openly ranges herself on the side of England. It is very doubtful if the arrangements between England and Germany have provided for that contingency.

Germany has very practical reasons for not combining with France and Russia in any serious enterprise. If she contributed to their success, she would be strengthening her enemies, and a day of reckoning would be sure to arrive. If they failed, she would share in their discomfiture; and, on measuring the comparative sea forces of the world, the balance is against success.

But Germany has other reasons for pausing before she commits herself to a line of action that would make her subordinate to Russia and France. What is her estimate of the real strength and resources of those two Empires? Do the confidential reports from Paris and St. Petersburg represent them as being in a sound and healthy condition, and able to bear the strain, not of a single campaign, but of a long war, waged in every quarter of the world? No one questions the military spirit of the French

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

soldier, but the French soldier would have very little to say in a war with England. Nor need the merit of the best part of the Russian Army be disputed; but India and China are still a long way off, and where else is the British Empire vulnerable from Russia? Such military strength as France and Russia undoubtedly possess is not of the kind to make them dangerous opponents to England at the present moment. On the other hand, the German authorities cherish no illusion on the capacity of the British fleet to deal with that of France and Russia combined. The immediate consequences of a war would be, therefore, the sweeping of the Mediterranean Sea, the Channel, and the China Seas by the British Navy. There would be some sanguinary engagements, some losses by the victors, but the result would be to put "Paid" to the account of French and Russian schemes beyond their land frontiers. What would be the consequences of those facts in the two Empires? How would France, overtaxed, miserable as she is at heart under the overshadowing military superiority of Germany, stand the humiliation of that discomfiture? How would Russia, immature, unready and probably rotten at the core, retain her position if to the loss of her fleet were added the collapse of the position she has laboriously gained in Eastern Asia, and which is based on an insecure foundation? There is no reason to believe that an accurate dissection of either of those States, if it were possible, would reveal a thoroughly sound constitution; and the first collision of the opposing fleets would reveal the truth as under the touch of Ithuriel's spear. Germany cannot pretend to be omniscient, but she showed that she possessed good information in 1870, and there is no reason to suppose that she is less accurately informed to-day. The policy of her ruler has so far been modified that he has drawn back from the policy which would have made him the ally of France and Russia against England; and all the barking of the anti-English press incited by Dr. Leyds and his influential German friends will not make him swerve from his course. But that policy is dictated by no regard for England; it is the result of a calm consideration of all the elements in the question. For this occasion, at least, we can feel sure that Berlin will not dance to the music set by Paris and St. Petersburg.

The possible Continental alliance against England resolves itself, by a process of elimination, into the opposition of France

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Russia—an opposition which, however serious, the British Empire can face with a reasonable amount of equanimity and confidence in the result. It is regrettable to see that, after over eighty years of peace and on some occasions of alliance, the rivalry and hatred of France for England exist just as keenly as at any time during the previous eight centuries of war. The French hate the Germans, but are afraid of them. They know that, unless they can produce a military genius of the highest order, the odds are overwhelmingly against them in any renewed struggle with Germany, and their "great" generals of late bear the names Boisdeffre, Mercier and Roget! They think it safer, therefore, to take out of the cupboard their old animosity toward England, and to provide their army with an opportunity of redeeming its good name at the expense of *"perfide Albion."* That is a dangerous sentiment to cherish against a State which has legitimate grievances against France's attitude from Newfoundland to the Chinese Province of Yunnan. A spark may at any moment produce an explosion in such a magazine of internal irritation and discontent as is the France of to-day. The further forbearance of England is not to be relied on if a Waima incident occurred on the Burmese frontier, or if Pierre Loti repeated in any form at Cabul Marchand's theatrical exhibition at Fashoda. Anglo-French relations have entered on a phase which must inevitably have a hostile termination, unless France has the wisdom to tack and steer an opposite course.

Neither the Russian Government nor the Russian people are swayed by any bitterly hostile feelings toward England such as animate all the nations of French race. They see in the British Empire a rival with which, at some future date, they will probably come into collision; but they have no wish to hasten the date. The rivalry of England and Russia is like the approach of a comet toward our planet. The political astronomers have not been able to fix the date of the impact, nor can they be absolutely sure that nature will not, at the eleventh hour, provide some means of averting the collision. But Russia is tied to France for better or for worse, and the conditions of her ally may cause her some reasonable apprehension. In a choice of evils, Russia may prefer to accompany France along a course that she does not approve of to leaving her in a state of internal discontent and disorder, which may sap her value to Russia as an ally. Even

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the Fashoda business, France received assurances that Russia would not fail her, although that Power hoped there would be no war. Nor was Russia's action confined to words. She sent 10,000 more troops to Central Asia, and strengthened her garrisons on the Afghan frontier. If she did this in regard to the Upper Nile difficulty, it is certain that she would do a great deal more in so important and interesting an occurrence as an attempt to save the Transvaal from becoming British. But there is no fear that France and Russia will attempt anything so Quixotic as helping the Boers to emerge from their condition as the vassals of England. All the denunciation in the press of England's tyranny and ambition will not, on the eve of a new century, induce those Powers to openly oppose what they know England has a perfect right to do. The practice of throwing projectiles, in the form of abuse and epithets, at the head of the English has always been a favorite pastime with Continental journalists. It amuses them and does not hurt us, as the song says; but the Governments know very well that the Boers have brought their punishment and changed fate on their own heads.

The action of France and Russia will be of a different form to that. It will not be less hostile to England, but it will be more practical. They cannot dream of aiding the Boers directly; nor, without the co-operation of Germany, which, I have shown by weighty reasons, they will not get, can they think of presenting an ultimatum to England of "Hands off the Transvaal!" But they may think that England is so occupied in South Africa that she will not oppose their proceedings somewhere else, and that she will look on while they appropriate certain points which they think will prove advantageous to them in the future. They may hold this opinion so strongly that, like the Emperor Nicholas I., they will believe that England, under the very considerable provocation they propose offering her, will still not fight at such a time as she is employed in South Africa, and, like that ruler, they may find that they are mistaken and have gone too far. At this moment it is not very certain what steps these two Powers are going to take; but one of the steps is undoubtedly a joint naval demonstration in the Persian Gulf, and another is probably a similar movement in the vicinity of Ceuta. In regard to both movements, Russia would take the lead, and it is believed in well informed circles that Count Mouravief arranged for the occupa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of Ceuta during his visit to Spain. Russia wishes to obtain a port on the southern coast of Persia, in order to secure a terminus for her projected line across that country and to anticipate the arrival of the Germans down the Euphrates. In regard to France, the direct practical advantage of these two moves is far from being clear, even if they were accompanied by a sentimental gain in the marriage of a Spanish princess, and possible future Queen, with so patriotic and chauvinistic a Frenchman as Prince Henry of Orleans.

Such are the schemes of our enemies, and the only practical question is whether the British Government will allow them to be carried into effect. The position of Ceuta is so admirable that the proposition has sometimes been put forward in Spain to offer it in exchange for Gibraltar. If there never was any strong reason for believing that the proposal would be accepted, there was at least nothing in the offer to make it appear ridiculous. If Ceuta was a strong place twenty years ago, the increased range of fortress artillery has made it more formidable than ever, and Gibraltar itself would be within the reach of its guns if it fell into the hands of a first-class Power. Before these lines can appear in print, the policy of the two Powers may have been unmasked, and England may have shown how she will regard it and what measures she proposes to take to safeguard herself. But it may be confidently predicted that any attempt to seize Ceuta will be treated as a *casus belli*. With regard to the proposed demonstration in the Persian Gulf, it is not possible to speak so clearly and positively. It depends very much on the size of the demonstration and the incidents accompanying it. It would not be a friendly step, of course, but its gravity might not warrant a declaration of war. We can all see that Russia is bound to have a hand in deciding the future of Persia, just as she is of China. These sick Asiatic countries will have to be healed by some one or other, and it is problematical if Russia will be stronger with a port on the Persian Gulf or without one. If Russia and France confine themselves to some movement in this quarter, war may be averted, because England can adopt counter precautions of her own at the Indian entrance to the Persian Gulf. The only obscurity is what benefit France expects to derive from measures so exclusively Russian. Perhaps she will receive assurances of future support in regard to her plans in southwestern China,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plans that are certain to bring England and France as rudely into conflict as they were brought on the Nile.

Taking a broad view of the international situation, and in the endeavor to pierce the clouds hanging over the European world, the final word may still be given in favor of the balance turning for peace, and for the adjournment of any serious effort to cripple England. This is probably the last occasion on which the hostile Powers will place a restraint on themselves before, taking wishes for certainties, they cross swords with the British Empire. The French people will conceal or restrain a little longer their desire to fight England. They may talk and threaten, but they will not imperil the success of their Exhibition. Russia is quite willing to wait, and also prefers her own slow methods to the impetuosity of her vivacious partner. The risk is that they may both go a little further than the British Government can stand, and before they well know what they have done they may find themselves engaged in a naval war that they little expected. The French military authorities cherish many fine schemes of establishing their reputation by a brilliant stroke at the expense of England. They have had, for some years, a plan for throwing a force across the Channel and seizing Dover. Its merit may be inferred from the fact that General Boulanger drew it up; and now they have added a project for seizing Malta or Gibraltar, one or both, by a *coup de main*, in which absolute treachery would play no small part. It is not strange that French generals should conceive these schemes, but it certainly is strange that they should think the schemes can be kept secret.

The real danger of the hour to England comes, then, from France, behind whom stands Russia, and if there is to be war, "the rescue of the Boers" will be as good a cry as any other. It will be received with general acclamation by the European public in States which have no pretense to have a voice in the matter, and even in Germany, where the decision to remain neutral will not prevent the mass of the people from hoping that England will meet with discomfiture and damage. At the latest, the close of the year will tell us what we must expect; but, in the worst event, the British Empire of to-day will give a good account of Russia and France combined and make them bitterly regret their decision to assail it.

DEMETRIUS C. BOULGER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME CONSECRATED FALLACIES.

BY AMOS K. FISKE.

In the course of human history many fallacies have been propounded, with the sanction of such high authority that they have imposed upon the minds of men and produced delusions which generations of growing enlightenment have been unable to dispel. The framers of the American Declaration of Independence were inspired by an ardent patriotism and by lofty motives, and their statements embodied a sufficient justification of the cause to which they sought to devote their countrymen; but there was no revelation of universal and eternal truth in the "glittering generalities" with which they prefaced those statements. On the contrary, they consecrated to perpetuity some of the most obvious fallacies that were ever promulgated to mislead men.

They proclaimed it to be a self-evident truth "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Whatever interpretation and exegesis may do for this declaration, in the sense in which it is commonly accepted and used in the place of argument, it is neither self-evident nor truth. There is nothing more evident to human observation and human reason than the inequalities with which men come into the world and pass through it and out of it. Not only are different races unequal in capacities of various kinds, but the members of the same race present every diversity of inequality. Nor can any power at the command of mankind make them equal in this world or in the processes of time, whatever may be their destiny in eternity.

It is useless to argue around this immutable fact, or try to interpret into the Declaration a meaning which it does not con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tain. All men are simply not created equal in any possible sense of the word. The negroes held in slavery by some of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were not created the equals of their masters nor of the average members of the race to which their masters belonged. The mass of the white people of the colonies were not all created equal, nor were the people of Mexico and South America at that time created equal to the people inhabiting the Republic then in the throes of birth.

The creation of men has been a gradual process of evolution, and they have been coming into being in different parts of the earth, through long generations, with differences and inequalities which development has varied and widened, and not obliterated. There are wide inequalities at birth and through life among the people of the United States, and inequalities less wide among the people of the Philippine Islands, and there is a large inequality between the people of this continent and of those islands. The fact is too glaring to be obscured by rhetoric.

Nor, in any strict sense of the word, can all men, or any men, be said to be endowed by their Creator with any rights whatever. Rights, in the political sense and in the social sense, are acquired or conceded as society and polity develop. There are principles of right which are fundamental and unchangeable, and as men advance they come more and more clearly to recognize and apply these, and thereby rights are slowly gained and firmly established. They are not the natural endowment, though they may be the far-off heritage, of all men. Rights, when once acquired, are not inalienable. Every human State and every human society has, perforce, to define and curtail the rights of its members; otherwise it could not exist and make progress. It grants and it modifies rights, and it is continually compelled to alienate and forfeit rights that have been inherited or acquired. It is still so in the freest and most enlightened land on earth.

Rights are alienated or forfeited by crimes against the State and offenses against social order and safety, and by incapacity to exercise them without harm to the general well-being. And among the rights alienable for such causes are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The wilful murderer of his fellow-man forfeits his right to life at the stern demand of justice, one of the immutable principles of right. The State justly alienates from the malefactor the right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men voluntarily surrender their rights for the benefit of their country, or for their own advantage; and all men's rights in civilized society are more or less curtailed and restricted, and in so far alienated, for the sake of harmony and security to the whole. The extent of the alienation depends upon the necessities of the case and the requirements of human order, and not upon degrees of divine endowment. This is the universal fact of human experience, whatever may be demanded by ideal theories.

Without doubt, governments are instituted among men to establish and secure rights, and to maintain that balance which is necessary to safety and progress. Do they derive their just powers from the consent of the governed? Let us not be blinded by the glitter of a generality, the meaning of which is not clearly defined. A statement which is susceptible of various interpretations and may have different and conflicting meanings, to suit the exigencies of polemics, is not an expression of universal and absolute truth. What is the consent of the governed?

Certainly the individual is and must be in many cases governed without his consent, and even against his protest, if social and political order is to be maintained and the general well-being subserved. Not only were the slaves held by some of the "fathers of the Republic" not the equals by creation of their masters, but they were governed in a kind of patriarchal system without their consent, though not in all cases against their will. The subjects of any kind of government are necessarily constrained to submit to an established authority, though they neither consent to its existence nor approve of the way in which its powers are exercised.

Is it, then, a question of the consent of the majority? That depends upon how the majority is composed, and what is the effect of its influence upon government. It is not really a question of the "greatest good to the greatest number," according to the judgment of the greatest number, but of the highest good to the whole, attainable by the combined wisdom and power of the whole. There was much distrust of the wisdom and of the power of numbers among the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the framers of the Federal Constitution. None of them practically regarded the consent of a majority of the subjects of government as the source of its just powers, or as necessary to their equitable exercise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The ordinary, if not the universal, manner of expressing popular consent is by a vote of the people. Most of the authors of the Declaration and the founders of the Constitution believed in a qualification of the suffrage that has been found necessary to the attainment of the ends of government and the security of the actual rights of its subjects. It would not be necessary in a commonwealth where intelligence was universal and education general, and the degrees to which it is necessary in the present human state vary with the intellectual and moral condition of the governed. It is the right of the organic whole of a community to be ruled by the preponderance of wisdom and ability to govern, rather than by the preponderance of numbers. In the nation launched by the Declaration of Independence, and in the States created under the Constitution, there have been various qualifications and modifications of the suffrage to secure better results in government, the very purpose and intent of which was to lessen the dependence of the government upon the consent of the governed.

Does consent of the governed, then, signify the acquiescence of a State, or of a community, in the control of any central or external authority that may be established over it? That, too, depends upon circumstances and conditions, and not upon any universal rule of right or self-evident truth. When the slave States withdrew their consent to the exercise of that national jurisdiction which the Federal Constitution had established, was the national Government bound, politically or morally, by the sacred principles of the Declaration of Independence to "let the erring sisters go?" We know the cost, in treasure, in the blood of men and in the tears of women, of bringing them back under the national authority without their consent. Was truth defied, was justice outraged, was the foundation principle of our Government subverted in the performance of that dreadful task, or was a stern but sacred duty discharged in saving the Union of States from overthrow?

But how about that very revolt of the thirteen colonies against the government exercised over them by the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland? It was for that emergency, and not for the future government of this or any other people, that our great Declaration was fulminated. Its authors deemed the colonies as already a "people," connected by political bands to another, but entitled by the laws of nature and of nature's God to a separate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and equal station among the powers of the earth. They believed that the time had come, in the course of human events, when those political bands should be dissolved, and, out of a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, they declared the causes that impelled to the separation.

In the situation of the country as it then was, with the alternative of oppression or independence confronting them, believing the people of the colonies to be the equals of those of the mother country, and equally entitled to a voice in the government to which they were subject, they prefaced their Declaration with that sweeping and glowing utterance, which had a broad application as truth to their case, but which becomes a delusive bundle of fallacies when promiscuously applied to the universal state of man, and which has taken the consecration of 1776 as giving it an "equal date with Sinai and with Ararat." But, in point of fact, the Revolution was not based upon any self-evident truth of the equality of men, or upon the theory that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

It was impelled by the wrongs which the colonies suffered at the hands of the mother country. It was induced by the unjust government that was exercised over them and the evil consequences that were thereby entailed upon their people. England's offense was not imposing her government upon the people of the colonies without their consent, but exercising that government unwisely and wrongfully to their harm. It was the circumstances of the case that justified the revolt and that made it successful, and no universal truth of the equality of men or fundamental principles of the consent of the governed. Circumstances made the people capable and fit for self-government, and they knew it. Circumstances justified them in declaring their independence and circumstances enabled them to achieve it. When they came to frame their own government, they acted upon the dictates of practical wisdom and exercised a saving common sense, which is our best heritage; and they thought no more of the native-born equality of all men or the theory of the consent of the governed. In all our history since, our political action has been determined by the practical requirements of every situation and the demands of the national well-being, and not by the dreamer's interpretation of the Declaration of Independence.

But suppose a people to be already independent; or, either

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alone or with the assistance of another people, to have broken away from a power that had previously ruled it, whether justly or unjustly. Can any nation be justified in stepping in and establishing a government over that people without their consent? This, again, depends upon the circumstances and conditions of the case, and not upon some universal truth or fundamental theory of human government.

The time has come in the course of human events when no people on the face of the earth can live for itself alone. With the progress of civilization, the peoples are coming so in contact with each other, and into such mutual relations, that the rights of one are affected by the rights of another, and adjustments are made necessary in which more than one voice must be heard. Circumstances, and the methods of Spain's administration in her colonies, made her government of Cuba without the consent of its people an outrage and a wrong. The damage of that government to the interests of the United States justified intervention to put an end to it. Do any of these facts or any antecedent truth make of the people of Cuba the equals of all created men, or do the laws of nature and of nature's God necessarily entitle them to a separate and equal station among the powers of the earth? The question of fitness for self-government—and nobody denies that there is such a question—involves the assumption of inequality of natural endowment among men. No people, as a people, can exercise the unrestrained right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness regardless of the rights and interests of their fellow peoples upon the earth. The right of the people of Cuba to independence and self-government depends upon their ability to exercise it to their own benefit and without detriment to the other peoples, who cannot escape relations with them of mutual good or harm. If intervention was justified to save them from the misrule of Spain, because interests of the United States were injuriously affected, intervention to save them from their own misrule might be justified for a like reason. There is no universal truth or fundamental principle which forbids their being governed without their consent, if rights and interests broader and higher than their own require it.

Take the present case of the Philippine Islands, to which our consecrated fallacies have been so freely applied of late. We are not concerned for the moment with questions of policy or the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wisdom of what has been done. But are the people of those islands, by creation or as the result of experience, as a whole and on the average, the equals of the people of the United States? Are they capable of governing themselves in a way which will secure to all the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness within their own domain, and safeguard the interests of others who cannot avoid holding relations with them? If not, are they entitled, by the laws of nature and of nature's God, to take a separate and equal station among the powers of the earth, regardless of what those powers may say or do in their own behalf? If they have that title, it is certain that it will not be respected by all the powers of the earth, and it can hardly be made valid by the consecration of the American Declaration of Independence.

The course of events in the last two years, whether rightly or wrongly we need not inquire, has placed the United States in a peculiar relation to the Philippine Islands, involving responsibilities to itself, to them and to the rest of the world. What the situation requires of us we will not discuss; but suppose it be admitted that the interests of all concerned—the United States, the Philippine Islands, and the rest of the world—would be best subserved by the exercise of the powers of government over the islands by the United States, is there any sacred truth, any principle of right or justice, that would forbid that consummation, without the consent of the people of the islands first had and obtained? Must the lack of that consent, even though induced by ignorance or incapacity of judgment, stand against a better judgment of what is for the well-being of the islands and their people; stand against the interests of the United States in that part of the world, however important they may be; stand against the interests of other nations toward whom we have assumed responsibilities, without regard to any and all consequences that might be entailed by our refusal to exercise the governmental powers which a situation of our making demands, but which cannot be derived from the consent of the governed?

We do not in fact know whether we would have that consent or not. A large proportion of the people know little and understand less of the controversy that is going on, and are in no position to give or to withhold their consent. Another large proportion, there is reason to believe, would gladly give their consent, if the opportunity were offered. The proportion which, under

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the dominant influence of a few strong and ambitious leaders, is actually resisting American control is a small one, but it makes a situation which renders a test of the question of consent impossible now. But the question is on the whole irrelevant. It is raised and seriously debated solely on the strength of an announcement which is either radically fallacious, or which has been rendered fallacious by misapplication, and which is held to be consecrated only because it is embodied in an instrument that all Americans revere for good and sufficient reasons. But the practical common sense of the American people will continue to insist upon the settlement of the political problems of the nation upon considerations of wisdom and justice, as they are able to see them to-day, and not under the sway of delusive fallacies solemnly promulgated a century and a quarter ago.

AMOS K. FISKE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRACTICE OF CONFESSION IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

BY THE REV. R. F. CLARKE, S. J.

THERE is no institution in the Catholic Church to which the average Protestant, whether he be an American or an Englishman, has a more deeply rooted antipathy than to the practice of auricular confession. He regards it as an unwarrantable invasion of the privacy of the individual conscience, an intrusion into the sacred domain of domestic life; as dangerous, demoralizing, a source of weakness to the will, and destructive of the habit of independence and mental self-reliance. I know that I am advocating an unpopular cause in undertaking to plead in its behalf, and that the very name carries with it an unpleasant sound in the ears of a majority of my readers.

At the same time, I feel sure that they will accede me a fair hearing. I ask them to listen to me, as far as they can, with minds unprejudiced, while I speak, from my own knowledge, of a system of which I have had a long and intimate experience, and which I have learned to love and value more and more in the last thirty years, during which I have myself been to confession at least once a week, and have, as a priest, heard many thousand confessions in various English-speaking countries.

I do not propose to enter on the thorny paths of religious controversy. I am no controversialist, and I doubt not that most of my readers share my dislike to controversy. My object in the present paper will be to state, as fairly and impartially as I can, the manifold advantages to the individual and to society which are the result of habitual confession, and to try to remove, if I can, some of the misconceptions which prevail respecting it, even among honorable and educated men. I need scarcely say that I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do not propose to enter the lists against the anti-Popery lecturer, or the professional declaimer against the "abominations of Rome." These unfortunate products of modern bigotry and intolerance I shall leave entirely alone. The class to whom they appeal are, for the most part, impervious to reason, and the infamous literature that they sow broadcast is of itself sufficient to condemn them.

The history of confession is too wide a field for me to attempt to enter upon. I will only say that Christians, from the very beginning, taking in their literal and obvious sense our Lord's words to His Apostles—"As my Father hath sent me, even so I send you. Whose sins you forgive, they are forgiven to them, and whose sins you retain, they are retained"—have always seen in the ministers of the Church the delegates and representatives of Christ, and have, in obedience to His command, made confession of their sins to them. The early literature on the subject is, indeed, scanty and imperfect; but it is sufficient to show that the practice of confession prevailed from the very first. Whether, in the first fervor of primitive Christianity, this confession was in all cases made in public, or whether this severe ordeal was confined to grave sins which gave serious scandal (the rest being confessed privately), is a disputed point. Modern investigation, however, tends to prove that, even in the earliest times, private sins were privately confessed.

Be this as it may, the writings of the Fathers and the decrees of local synods bear ample witness to the general custom of auricular confession as prevailing in East and West alike. The Lateran Council, in 1215, did not impose the practice on the faithful, but simply determined the minimum that the Church required. To argue from the decree of this Council, ordering that all shall confess their sins at least once a year, that confession was never previously enforced, is an utterly unwarrantable inference. It would be just as reasonable to conclude that if a Government were to order a mathematical examination of boys in all public schools to be held once a year, no mathematical examination had ever been previously exacted; or that if a State Legislature were to direct that all the children in its industrial schools were to have a bath at least once a month, the children in them had never been made to take a bath before. What the Council did was to define what had hitherto been undefined, to determine what was the minimum of obligation for the faithful all the world over. I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merely notice this in passing, for I am now considering auricular confession, not historically, but in its relation to the needs of men in modern society, and as affecting for good or evil those who habitually practise it.*

The natural origin and fountain-head of confession is to be found in an instinct of human nature, which leads us to communicate to others any strong emotion present to the soul, any powerful influence engendering in us joy or sorrow, hope or fear, self-approbation or self-reproach. If some counter motive render concealment necessary, the suppression will be painful to us, and will aggravate our suffering, where the influence present to the soul is one unfavorable to its happiness. Now, a sense of guilt is, of all emotions which affect the soul, the one which causes the most deeply rooted misery, and is the most destructive of all true peace. Shame, self-reproach, fear, remorse, disgust at the thought of the past, and despondency at the prospect of the future, all combine to make life almost intolerable. The desire to exterminate that which is the source of our mental suffering sometimes becomes irresistible. The story of Eugene Aram is an instance in point, as is that of the murderer who approached the cradle of his victim's infant in order that he might whisper to a human ear the crime that he could no longer bear in silence. Probably most of my readers have, in the course of their lives, listened to the confidences of some friend or acquaintance who poured forth, in the gloaming or by the dull fire-light, the honest and self-accusing story of his past misdeeds. I am not concerned with the source of this curious instinct of self-revelation, but the fact of the relief that it affords to the heavily burdened soul is undeniable. It certainly is much stronger among Christians than among those who belong to other religions; and the reason of this is that the sense of the evil of sin is far more keen in those who believe in the Incarnation and death of the Son of God. Almost every revival of religion, outside the Catholic Church, has been accompanied with some form or other of public or private confession. The early Wesleyans related in public their religious "experiences," and the leaders of the evangelical movement at the beginning of the present century received

*A valuable bit of evidence on the practice of Confession in England in Anglo-Saxon times is found in the "Dialogue of Egbert" (A. D. 766-91.) "*Haec, Deo gratias, a temporibus Vitaliani Papæ et Theodori Dorobernensis Archiepiscopi inolevit in Ecclesia Anglorum consuetudo, ut etiam laici cum conjugibus et liberis suis ad confessores suos pervenirent, et se. . . . cum elemosynarum largitione mundarent, quatenus nuriores Dominicæ Communionis perceptionem in Natale Domini perciperent.* (Haddan & Stubbs; Councils, III. 413.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from their disciples a "manifestation of conscience" that was little else than a confession of their sins. The rapid growth of the practice of confession among the Ritualists is not a mere imitation of Rome, but is the natural outcome of their religious earnestness and sincerity.

All this proves the necessity of providing some carefully guarded and recognized outlet for that instinct of human nature which leads a man to give relief to his sense of personal guilt by some external manifestation of his evil deeds. The more intense his sense of guilt, the more unbearable does it become, unless he has the opportunity of getting rid of, or at all events of lightening, his burden, by revealing the source of his misery to some one or more of his fellow-creatures in whose prudence and sympathy he can confide. I have myself known several instances in which the sense of sin made life so intolerable as to lead to an attempt, and in one or two cases a successful attempt, to commit suicide. Our lunatic asylums contain patients not a few who have lost their reason from the same cause. All of these, or most of them, would certainly have been saved if they could have had recourse to the Catholic confessional and poured out their tale of misery and sin into the sympathetic ears of the confessor. I have myself often heard from the lips of those who had told some sad tale of wilful and long-continued sin the joyful exclamation, "Now, father, I begin to feel better." The inexpressible relief was due, in great measure, to the mere outpouring of their sad story. They were employing what was the natural, as well as the supernatural, means of escaping from the crushing and intolerable burden.

But there is a further provision for the needs of human nature that confession, and confession only, can supply. Every one who goes astray has an undefined and vague intention of beginning, at some time or other, a new and a better life. He wants to give up the evil which in his heart he hates, and he means to do so when a convenient season comes. But the difficulty is to determine the time when that happy moment shall arrive. We are all procrastinators, especially where immediate action means a struggle with ourselves and the relinquishment of that to which we are attached. So we put off and put off, until the chain that binds us down becomes so strong that it is a moral impossibility to shake ourselves free of it. Men sometimes fix for themselves a special day which is to be the beginning of a new life—their next birth-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day, for instance, or the first day of the coming year. But, in point of fact, the promised reformation very rarely takes place when the appointed day arrives, or if, for a short time, there is a change for the better, the improvement, unsupported as it is by any fresh influences for good appertaining to the new era, soon fades away and disappears.

Now, this need of a turning point for good, of a special date and limit from which the old things shall have passed away, and all things shall have become new, is supplied by the confessional as nothing else in the world can supply it. The Catholic who is desirous of turning over a new leaf and of overcoming his past faults and frailties, but who at the same time is conscious of his own weakness, turns instinctively to that wholesome tribunal, where he knows that he will find a kind and attentive listener, a man who has had long experience of the various snares and pitfalls that beset our path through life, and who can, therefore, sympathize with all the difficulties that have to be encountered by one who is entering on a struggle with evil, and on the serious pursuit of what is good. The sinner who has learned to hate himself, and who feels himself unable, by his own unaided efforts, to free himself from the yoke of sin, will there find a prudent, patient and skilful counsellor, who will have a hundred devices to suggest for meeting the force of temptation, and a hundred means by which he may strengthen himself in the practice of virtue. The confessor will make for him "the crooked ways straight, and the rough places plain." He will encourage him where encouragement is needed, and warn him where there are dangers to be avoided. So he betakes himself—perhaps in fear and trembling, but still with a hope long unknown to him and a confidence to which he has long been a stranger—to that fountain provided for the washing away of sin and uncleanliness, and for the strengthening of good resolutions and aspirations after a new and better life, which is to be found in every Catholic church. In the priest in the confessional he knows that he will have a father, a friend and a guide. In him he sees God's own representative, and there rise to his lips, instinctively and naturally, the words of the prodigal in the Gospel, "I will arise and go to my father, and will say to him, 'Father, I have sinned.'" In this way the tribunal of penance, quite apart from the grace of the sacrament, with which I am not now concerned, is simply an invaluable instrument of reformation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How valuable and how effective it is, is of course better known to priests than to any other class; and it is one of the greatest consolations of their sacred ministry to think of the hundreds whom they have thus helped over the rough places that beset the first struggle after virtue, and who will one day tender them their grateful thanks for the help that they have received from them in their sore time of need.

In close connection with this "ministry of reconciliation" is a further and a scarcely less important advantage attaching to the confessional, that it affords a sure and a safe resort to all who are in any kind of moral or intellectual perplexity or distress. I imagine that very few of my readers have not, at some time or other in their lives, found themselves in some harassing doubt or difficulty from which they knew not how to extricate themselves. Their trouble may have arisen from their own fault, or it may have been entirely independent of any action of their own. It may have arisen from within, or it may have been the result of exterior circumstances which have hedged them in with embarrassment that for the time made their lives a misery, or, at all events, very seriously interfered with their happiness and peace of mind. Those who have delicate consciences, men with a naturally high sense of honor or justice, are especially liable to these storms of mental suffering. Their very anxiety to do what is right aggravates their trouble; they are torn asunder by a number of opposing motives and influences, and sometimes do not know which way to turn. Let me take one or two instances such as often occur in modern life. A man in a position of responsibility has, under stress of some pressing need, borrowed (or embezzled) some of his employer's money. He has tided over the difficulty by some dishonest falsification of his accounts. There is every chance of his escaping undetected, for he is a man whose character stands high, and in whom his employer placed the most implicit confidence. But his conscience will not let him rest. He is simply miserable at the thought of his betrayal of his trust. He is bound to confess his misdeeds to his employer, to be dismissed in shame and disgrace, to drag down to misery those near and dear to him, his loving wife and his innocent children. Another man is in business for himself, say as a picture dealer, and he is much troubled in conscience as to certain misrepresentations which he has made with regard to the antiquity or the origin of the pictures that he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wishes to sell. These misrepresentations are not actually false, but they are of a nature to mislead the intending purchaser. They are in line with the universal practice of the trade in the city where he dwells, and without them his business would be liable to be ruined. What is he to do under these difficult circumstances? Or, to take a very different case. A girl is living at home with her mother and sister. She is not necessary to her mother's happiness or comfort, but, without doubt, she adds much to it. She has, however, for some time felt strongly drawn toward consecrating her life to God among the good Sisters of Charity, whose self-sacrificing devotion to the poor has made their white caps and gray dress dear even to non-Catholics. What ought she to do? Is she bound to obey the voice within and to leave those dear to her, in order to follow out at any cost what she believes to be her vocation? Or is it all a delusion, her real duty being to be the solace of her mother's advancing years? How conducive, how necessary, to her peace of mind that some wise counsellor should help her in deciding the question she cannot decide for herself! Children, too, have their own difficulties. Every confessor of boys has been asked, "Father, is it a sin to go out of bounds without leave? Is it a sin to use a crib? Is it a sin to have a fight with another boy?" Even little girls are sometimes perplexed in conscience. "Father, is it a sin to slap my little sister when she is naughty? Is it a sin to take chocolates out of mother's work-box?" Sometimes the questions are on matters of more serious import, for the voice within does not always clearly promulgate even the precepts of the natural law. In all these questions, great and small, it is of incalculable benefit to young and old to be able to resort to one who will clearly draw the line between right and wrong and set at rest the troubled conscience.

In all such cases the confessional furnishes a counsellor who is perfectly unprejudiced, whose one and only desire is to promote the happiness and well-being of his penitent, who speaks with the authority belonging to his office, whose long experience gives weight to his words, and who, above all, knows the severe account that Almighty God will exact of him, and the awful responsibility of the task entrusted to him. He knows that if he swerves one hair's-breadth from the law of God in the advice given, out of any human respect, or desire to please, or any other inferior motive, he will be guilty of a great sin before God. What better means than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this could possibly be devised for giving peace to troubled souls, or for settling doubts and difficulties that, to those who are entangled in them, often seem insoluble? I do not mean to say that the confessor is infallible, or may not judge the case wrongly. But there is every possible chance that his judgment will be the right one, and that he will be able to give such advice as may release the perplexed conscience from its difficulties and dangers. My own experience is that seldom have I encountered any problem as to future action, however apparently hopeless, which did not admit of a solution that was not only practically possible, but that could be carried out without any very serious difficulty by the person asking advice.

Another benefit attaching to the practice of confession is one that, I think, cannot fail to be appreciated by any one who calls himself, even in the widest sense, a Christian. One of the great dangers of the present day is a want of a sufficient appreciation of the evil of sin as an offense against Almighty God. Utilitarianism holds a pernicious sway over the opinion of modern society respecting right and wrong. If the law of God forbids any course of conduct which utilitarianism declares to be beneficial to society, well, so much the worse for the law of God. I do not mean to say that any except an extreme school of modern theorists would put the matter in this crude form; but it underlies a great deal of the opinion now prevalent respecting right and wrong. This or that course of action cannot be bad, because it does no possible harm to others; it must be good, because it can be shown to be advantageous to society. Why should we regret any of our actions in the past if neither we, nor any one else, are, as far as we can judge, a whit the worse for them?

This habit of mind is one that is fostered by a career of prosperity and success. It is all very well to say that we all have within us the dread tribunal of conscience, declaring, with a voice that cannot be silenced, the guilt of sin and its hatefulness in the sight of God, apart from any evil results that may proceed from it. This is true; but conscience, if it be disregarded, soon ceases to speak with the same distinctness, or else the deafened ears fail to hear its sentence of condemnation. It needs an external sanction, a human voice without, that shall be the echo of the voice of God within. It needs, moreover, the help of some authoritative tribunal, outside of him, which shall compel the wrongdoer to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take counsel of his conscience and reckon up with its help the different occasions on which he has disobeyed its voice, in order that he may obtain forgiveness by a full and frank confession of them all to one who must, as God's representative, take cognizance of them all, and pass on the guilty accuser of himself a sentence of punishment which shall in some way correspond to the heinousness of his sin. One of the most valuable elements of confession is the examination of conscience that necessarily precedes it. It brings a man face to face with his sins as nothing else can. He knows that if they are to be forgiven, not one must be concealed; and he knows, too, that he must use all care and diligence to see that none is, through any negligence on his part, omitted from the black list. They must all be told, the number however great, and the kind of sin however disgraceful and humiliating. I can scarcely imagine anything that has a greater power to quicken the sense of the heinousness of sin than this necessity of first coming face to face with it in careful self-examination, and then putting into words the results which that self-examination has revealed. And here I may remind my readers that this advantage is altogether lost unless the integrity of confession is strictly enforced. Once allow the penitent to tell what seems good to him, and to omit whatever he is reluctant to confess, and the value of confession, as enforcing a sense of the evil of sin, disappears. The judge must know all the details of the offenses committed, else how can he pass a just sentence? Nothing must be hidden from him, inasmuch as he is God's representative. It is the telling of this humbling tale which keeps alive in the heart of the Catholic that keen appreciation of the evil of sin, the fading away of which is an irreparable loss to Protestant society.

And it is the fact that the tale is such a humbling one that furnishes the tribunal of penance with another most potent weapon for the encounter with evil and for the salvation of souls.

Of all sins there is none so deadly and so hateful to God as pride, and, on the other hand, there is no virtue more indispensable to all those who desire to follow in the footsteps of Christ than the virtue of humility. Without humility every other virtue is a mere pretense and counterfeit; with it every good and perfect gift can be obtained from the Most High. Nothing is more prominent in the teaching of Our Lord and His Apostles than the all-importance of humility. The Pharisees were liberal in their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alms, mortified in their lives, lengthy in their prayers; but their pride spoilt it all. The publican beating his breast was humble, and therefore was forgiven. While God has compassion on sinners, we are told that He hates the proud. But there is no need to dwell on the truism that, of all Christian duties, the most essential is that we "humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God." Now, of all Christian practices I think that there is none so humbling, so humiliating, as the practice of confession. To tell to a fellow-creature the evil thoughts that we have indulged, the mean, selfish, disgraceful acts that we have done, and to tell them in all their naked hideousness, is a process which knocks the pride out of a man better than any other that I know of in the whole world. It is this which makes the confessional so unpopular with average Englishmen in the present day. Cardinal Manning said in one of his temperance speeches that drunkenness is the besetting sin of England. Drunkenness is bad enough, God knows, not only in itself, but because of the other sins which follow in its train. Nevertheless, I do not agree with His Eminence. I am quite certain that pride is far more subtle, more dangerous, more deadly, more ruinous to the souls of men, than drunkenness. It is a respectable vice, a vice which breeds no remorse in the soul, a vice which is often accompanied with a great show of virtue, and even of piety, a vice which carries with it a fatal blindness and hardness of heart, a vice that renders a man impervious to the sweet influences of God's grace. Now, a true, heartfelt confession of sin is incompatible with pride. This is why the tribunal of penance has always been one of the most cherished institutions in the Catholic Church. This too is the reason why it never can take root and flourish in any of those forms of religion which have thrown off the yoke of the Church, and proclaimed the right of private judgment and the autocracy of the individual conscience. To confess one's sins to God, Who knows them all already, requires no exercise of humility, such as is involved in confessing them to a human being, who knows nothing of them beforehand. It would be simply an intolerable abasement of self, at least to the ordinary Christian, unless he saw in that human being God's delegate and representative, and unless he knew that this abasement of himself is a necessary condition to the salvation of his soul.

I must add yet another advantage of confession of a very different kind. It has probably often occurred to the mind of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most Catholics, as it has often occurred to my own, that if there were no other proof of the paramount claims of the Catholic Church, we should find a sufficient one in the elaborate care with which she watches over the innocence of the young. To guard from evil and corruption the lambs of the fold is one of her chief duties and privileges. This loving care she inherits from her Divine Founder, Who was the friend and lover of little children. Now, I do not think that it is possible for any unprejudiced and well-informed person, who compares the practical working of the Catholic system with that of any other religious system in the world, to deny her unrivalled and unapproachable superiority in this respect. She shields her little ones in their early childhood with all the jealous care of the most tender mother, and when the time comes for the safe seclusion of the parental roof to be exchanged for a freer intercourse with their fellows, she provides safeguards for their purity that are unknown, or almost unknown, outside her fold. For the due education of boys, large schools, and for those of the upper class, large boarding-schools, are a practical necessity. Then comes the dangerous time, and how great the dangers of that time are is well known to every one who has had an experience of the inner working of English public schools. To keep boys safe from a most perilous, if not a fatal, contact with vice and sin, is a problem which has exercised the mind and troubled the conscience of every one who has taken part in the management of any of our large schools and colleges; and those among Protestant educators who have studied the subject most deeply, and who have had long experience to guide them, have had to admit, with sorrow and grief, that the task was a hopeless one. They have had to submit to what they considered an inevitable evil, and their best hope has been by personal influence to mitigate to some extent that which they knew they were powerless to prevent. But is the evil one for which no remedy can be provided? God forbid! The Catholic Church provides an effective remedy for this, as for every other evil incident to human life. Here I can speak from a large experience, and with a full knowledge of the subject. Again and again I have been assured by boys who have passed through Catholic colleges, from the lowest to the highest form, that during the whole of their time there they never heard one immodest word, or came into contact with any sort of temptation to evil from those with whom they associated. I have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

known some who at the end of their school course were as innocent of moral evil as on the day they entered, and were utterly shocked and disgusted when they were thrown into the vortex of the world outside, and had to listen to the kind of talk that too often forms the common staple of conversation among those who have had a Protestant education.

I shall, perhaps, be told that the Catholic system is a "hot-house system," and I accept the simile. Does the prudent gardener expose his tender plants, during their early growth, to the cold east wind and the nipping frosts? If he wants them to be strong and sturdy, he watches over them and shelters them from the fatal influences that will blight their growth and leave traces of evil that can never be wholly removed. In like manner does the Catholic Church. She, too, guards her tender plants, and with prudent vigilance avails herself of the means with which Christ has provided her, to train them up to habits of virtue and to a hatred of sin, fostering their moral strength and their love of all that is pure and of good report, that so she may send them forth, when their manhood shall have come, armed in full panoply, to do battle with all the perils which they will then have to encounter and with the evils which will then beset their path. I do not say that the Church is always successful in her endeavors. It is quite possible that, even in a Catholic school, evil may for a time run riot. One sinner may destroy much good. But the evil never lasts long, and the Catholic system brings about a speedy recovery. What I do assert is that the moral perils to which a boy is exposed in a Catholic school are infinitesimal as compared with those which will surround him in any of the Protestant public schools and colleges.

In all this the chief engine for the good work is the confessional. There are, of course, many others. There is the personal influence, and the keen sense of responsibility, of those who are in authority; there is the close and intimate friendship existing between the teacher and the taught, which is something utterly different from the comparatively cold relations and official reserve which make the Protestant master far more of a stranger to his boys. But it is the weekly or fortnightly confession that is the real safeguard. It is in the confessor that he has his trusted friend, to whom he freely talks of all his dangers and temptations; it is confession that keeps the moral atmosphere healthy and pure;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is confession that maintains the high standard of life and conversation prevailing, through God's mercy, in our Catholic schools and colleges; it is confession which enables the Catholic parent to entrust his boy to the good priests, whether secular or regular, who devote themselves to the work of education, without any of those qualms or fears, that anxiety and foreboding about the future, that fill the heart of the Protestant parent when he bids farewell to his innocent child on his first plunge into the vortex of a Protestant public school.

But there is one charge, one false and cruel charge, which some Protestant writers bring against confession. They say that it introduces the young and innocent to a knowledge of subjects which are *sacro digna silentio,* and even suggests to them evil of which they would otherwise be ignorant. I can only assure my readers (in answer to this gratuitous calumny), on the word of an honest man, that during the twenty years and more that I have been constantly hearing confessions of men and women, boys and girls, of every class and in various countries, I have never once known of a single instance of any knowledge of evil having been imparted in the confessional. I am sure that I may speak for all my fellow-priests all over the world, when I say that I would, with God's help, far rather be torn in a thousand pieces than say one word in the confessional that could endanger the purity of the young or impart a knowledge of evil to one previously ignorant of it.

But if there should be any of my readers who are not willing to accept my own personal assurance, there is another consideration which ought to convince them. If there were in this accusation the smallest element of truth, every good mother would, in her tender care for her children's innocence, have the greatest horror of seeing her little ones kneeling before the priest, and every careful father would forbid his boys and girls from incurring the risk of such contamination. Is this the case? Do we find good Catholic parents dreading the influence of the confessional for their children? On the contrary, there is nothing that gives them more hearty satisfaction than to know that their sons and daughters are, from their earliest years, regular in making their confession month by month or week by week. They regard it as the best possible safeguard for their innocence and virtue. They are alarmed and anxious if, when boyhood merges into youth, their sons grow

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

irregular in frequenting the tribunal of penance. They fear there must be something wrong. They urge and entreat them not to fall away from the practice of confession. Joy fills the mother's heart when she sees her son once more returning, it may be after long absence, to that fount of mercy and of grace, where she knows he will obtain pardon for the past, and strength and help for the struggles of the future. Ask any of the heads of those Catholic families whose names are a household word for all that is noble and honorable and of good report, what is their opinion of the institution which is thus maligned, and they will tell you, one and all, that it is for themselves a continual source of comfort and happiness and consolation and peace, and that their best wish for all those dear to them is that they shall share the incalculable benefits that they know by their own experience it confers. They will tell you that it is their stay and support, that it binds together the members of a household, reconciles those who are at variance, teaches children to be obedient to their parents, and parents to be gentle and patient and forbearing with their children; the wife to obey her husband, and the husband to love and cherish his wife; in a word, that it teaches all to fulfil the duties of their station, to observe the laws of God and of the Church, to live a chaste, sober, honest, godly life, and to die a holy and happy death.

I have said little or nothing of the supernatural benefits attaching to the confessional, or of the sacramental grace that flows into the souls of those who avail themselves of it. My object has been to dwell chiefly on the natural advantages of the confessional. And I have been speaking of the Catholic confessional, and of it alone. For confession, like every other great instrument for good, has its dangers, and very serious ones. Against these dangers the Catholic Church takes the most careful precautions; but I do not see how they can be guarded against in a communion where no such precautions exist; where the confessor has no recognized training for his difficult and responsible duties; where the practice is discouraged and discountenanced by those in authority, and is regarded with suspicion and dislike by the mass of those who are invited to avail themselves of it.

R. F. Clarke, S. J.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AFTER THE YACHT RACE.

BY SIR THOMAS LIPTON.

In accepting the courteous invitation of the Editor to say my say about the yacht race in these pages, I am delighted to repeat and to emphasize to the people and press of the United States, and to Mr. Iselin himself personally, my acknowledgements of their kindness and their fairness in all that related to me and to my challenge. Their fairness I took for granted from the first, as some readers of this Review will, no doubt, remember. If any one else ever thought that the course could not be kept clear, for example, or that the challenger would be hampered in any way whatever, I do not envy him his reflections now. Captain Evans might well have hoisted the broom, as a symbol of the masterly way in which he swept those seas.

I went to America with high hopes of winning the Cup, and with the expectation of a friendly reception. My hopes have been disappointed, but my expectations have been far exceeded. Never can I forget the thousand and one acts of goodwill shown me during my stay in American waters, nor the multitude of friendly faces that watched my departure from her shores. I did not win the Cup, but I did secure a much better token—that of the abiding brotherhood of our two peoples.

Of the press, I should like to add a special word, and it will be this—that it showed itself always considerate in its most enterprising moments, and that I made in America many friends among journalistic masters of the art of concealing under a light style the labors incidental to the very efficient exercise of their professional duties.

The Government itself was in absolute accord with the popular sentiment, and its offer of a way of landing at Sandy Hook,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and of the use of its wires and its workshops, will always be held in memory by me, and I think I may add, without any nonsense, by a large number of my fellow-countrymen.

It was my good fortune to be present at the welcome given to Admiral Dewey, and to have a place in that wonderful procession, for which the two Jubilee processions in London had only partially prepared me; so that I had before me this great object lesson of America's fervent patriotism and of America's generosity of good feeling toward myself as the representative of another country. It was impossible not to be impressed by the one sentiment and the other, and doubly so by their existence in harmony together.

Many people have spoken to me of the useful revival in our own time of some of the offices fulfilled of old by the Olympian games. The athletic and poetic contests that took place between States of ancient Greece politically independent of each other and lying as far apart as Rhodes from Sicily—and that gave Pindar, from yet another State, the opportunity for an ode to the victor—did undoubtedly serve to create a national solidarity of race, of religion, even of literature and language. I do not see why the modern contests in cricket, in football, in yachting or in various other forms of sport, should not serve the same end to-day. My preference is with yachting, a form of contest that involves a high intelligence in designer and skipper, that has no taint of cruelty in its exercise, and that provides a spectacle as pretty as any in the world.

"Shamrock" bore her name with a purpose; yet she had no warmer wishes for her success in Ireland than she had in England, in Scotland, or in Wales. She had the colonies, too, to wish her good luck. She rode triumphantly over any seas dividing our own peoples; she gave us solidarity at home. Perhaps the uses of the race did not end wholly with this agreeable example of unity between the three kingdoms, or with the amity it exhibited between England and America. If the Book of Job had to be written again, a windless day off Sandy Hook, while two yachts were waiting to pit against each other their vast expanse of sail, might serve the purpose of the allegory. That was a school of patience in which it is something to have graduated, as did we who planned the race, and as did they who assembled to see it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is proverbially unwise to try to repeat a pleasant experiment. The repetition is apt to pall. Well, we are not all wise always. However, I can say no more on that subject, until I have had opportunities of consulting Mr. Fife, not yet recovered from the illness which was so unfortunate for himself during the contest, and unfortunate, perhaps, for the "Shamrock."

These are the reflections and recollections which arise in my mind as I recall the memorable weeks spent on the "Erin" in American waters; and I have really nothing to add, except one more most grateful acknowledgment of all the pleasure and instruction I derived from the whole episode—a pleasure with so many ramifications that the failure to lift the coveted Cup seemed hardly to diminish it.

THOMAS LIPTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EAST INDIAN WOMEN.

BY MRS. F. A. STEEL, FORMERLY PROVINCIAL INSPECTRESS OF GOVERNMENT AND AIDED SCHOOLS IN THE PUNJAB.

CONSIDERING that the general conditions of womanhood in India are capable of verification by the least inquiry and a very small amount of observation, it is surprising what an amount of --I will not say ignorance but what is worse—the misconception which comes from imperfect knowledge exists concerning the question even among Anglo-Indians who have passed their lives within easy reach of the facts.

I scarcely think I exaggerate when I say that nine-tenths of the English women who manifest that somewhat over-sentimental interest in their Indian sisters, which shows itself in working for zanana* bazaars, are firmly imbued with the belief:

(1.) That no widow in India is allowed to marry again;

(2.) That every girl is married, not betrothed, before her teens;

(3.) That every woman is secluded.

Now, all these three beliefs are not only false, but they make it impossible to arrive at the truth in regard to many another question.

The erroneous impression in regard to the universality of enforced widowhood does the least harm of the three, since the legislation necessary to give the individual freedom on this point is already an accomplished fact. This is all the more curious, because the only practical effect of abolishing *suttee*† (as we did by a stroke of the pen) was to substitute a soul-sickening life for a soul-satisfying death. The real laying of the axe to the root of

*Zanana, women's apartments; from the Persian *Zan*, a woman.

†*Suttee*, properly *sati*, good, pure. Used to designate the good, chaste wife who immolates herself on her husband's funeral pyre. The practice was forbidden by the English in 1829, but is not yet extinct.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the upas tree which overshadowed so many a poor soul was when, by removing the civil disabilities of widowhood, we made life bearable.

But this upas tree, at most, overshadows but half the total number of women in India. Even amongst Hindoos, enforced widowhood is not universal. Many of the agricultural tribes practise the Mosaic law of re-marriage to the dead husband's younger brother; and in India brothers include cousins. I have no wish to minimize the flagrant injustice of condemning a woman to go through life without a chance of fulfilling the functions of her womanhood. At the same time, I would point out that there is an ever-increasing number of Western girls who are in similar case. These may have consolations, more than consolations, for what is, virtually, a celibacy enforced by the custom of the society in which they dwell. They say they have, at any rate!

But the Hindoo widow also has hers, in the conviction of the indissoluble bond with the dead man, which is only comparable to, though it is absolutely distinct in its impersonality from, the sentimental exaltation of feeling which, with us, makes a woman remain unmarried for the sake of a dead lover. Some of the happiest women I have known in India, certainly some of the best, have been widows indeed.

In regard to the second belief in the universality of child marriage, the margin of error introduced by it is far greater; so great as to prevent a right solution of the problem. By believing it to be, as it were, inherent in the family life of India from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, we inevitably make any legislation on the subject almost inconceivable. Now, my personal experience—I admit that this is a broken reed in regard to a huge continent like India, but it is all I have to offer—tells me that the actual ceremony of the *makh lawa, gauna* or *garbhadau*—in other words, what we should call marriage—seldom takes place, even among Hindoos in Upper India, until the age of twelve. For their own convenience, the parents will delay this till sixteen; and among some agricultural tribes, notably the Jâts, it is no unusual thing for a forlorn husband to have to sue for the possession of a virgin wife out of her teens, some buxom lass whose services are valuable on the ancestral farm. The tendency amongst even educated natives is to deny this experience of mine, for very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

few, even amongst them, are willing to confess that child marriage has no religious sanction whatever; and they have the very greatest reluctance to admit a fact which would weaken their claim to non-interference; namely, that they themselves constantly set this custom aside for their own convenience.

Nevertheless, most will admit that the ceremony which marks the entry into actual conjugal relations only dates, as a separate function, from the sixteenth century. Before that, everything points to the betrothal—marriage taking place in such close sequence as practically to prove that it was necessary for the bride to have reached a marriageable age. Indeed, the fundamental idea which underlies the duty of the earliest possible marriage—that is, the semi-material, semi-spiritual subtlety which finds murder even in the prevention of possible life—shows that this possibility of life must be the potent factor in determining the age for marriage, and so puts this plea for infant marriage out of court.

We must, therefore, look elsewhere for the cause which has forced down the betrothal age, dissociated it from actual marriage, and made the latter possible when one or both the contracting parties are practically immature. As regards the higher classes, Mr. Ibbetson and Mr. Risley are doubtless right in attributing early betrothal to the necessity for hypergamy; but this affords us no clue to the cause which brought about what is actually a setting aside of the whole Indian theory of marriage from a religious point of view. And it is idle to say that this setting aside is due to imperfect physiological knowledge and a false estimate of natural phenomena. Here, again, my practical experience tells me that the mothers of India were quite as much alive to the futility of attempting to steal a march on nature as I was myself. It has been suggested, of course, that this forcing down of the marriageable age was made necessary by the lawless libertinism of Mohammedan conquerors; but, except that they are synchronous, I fail to find any possible connection between the two facts. Neither the presence, nor the absence, the reality nor unreality, of a prior claim affects mere lawlessness. No doubt, the bride's parents would attempt to shift their responsibility on the husband as early as possible; but it is equally sure that the latter's parents would not allow this, unless the bride was actually of an age to be a useful member of the household.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Again, if this theory of the protective power of a husband were true, we should certainly expect to find the custom of early marriage strongest amongst those who were most exposed to the risk of such libertinism. But that is exactly what we do not find. In the Punjab and down the Gangetic Valley, where the Mohammedan hordes marched and countermarched for centuries, immature marriage is the exception, not the rule; while among the peasantry, amid the infinitely great risks of outdoor laboring life, the marriageable age touches its highest limit. In Robtak, Gurgeon, Karnal, all districts in the immediate vicinity of Delhi, the centre round which Mohammedan conquest raged, the Jâts and other cognate races stand pre-eminent both for the freedom of their women and the mature age to which marriage is deferred.

Finally, it is inconceivable that the Hindoos should resort to the uncertain shield of a husband, when the new fashion of seclusion, which is also synchronous with conquest, gave them a far more efficient one. Indeed, I fail to see why they should have adopted seclusion from their conquerors, as they did with astonishing speed, had it not been for the immunity from all but organized outrage on their women which it afforded.

Therefore, though it is undoubtedly true that the colonization of India by Mohammedan races had the effect of dissociating betrothal from marriage, and so by degrees lowering the age for both, I see no reason for putting this down directly to libertinism. That most likely led to a whole-hearted adoption of seclusion; but it is the seclusion itself which led to child marriage, as I hope to show further on.

And this brings us to our third erroneous belief, namely, that every woman in India is secluded. This is the most harmful of all, for it is responsible for a great deal of quite unnecessary respect for the laws governing a custom which is considered to be universal. Even Lady Dufferin, than whom no one has a better right to speak on the subject, seems to me to help toward maintaining this false impression when she wrote in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* entitled "Woman in India," that "*under the present conditions of Eastern life, seclusion offers many undoubted advantages,*" and that "*neither the men nor the women of the country are prepared for its abolition.*"

I remember how, when I was reading these sentences, my mind's eye reverted to an incident of my camp life in India — to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a wide plain of golden grain, circled by a rim of golden sky; to a group of women, stalwart and strong, with a gleam of looking-glass embroidery in their full blue petticoats, a sheen of yellow silk upon the madder-red veils cast back from their honest faces, their full brown throats, and their capable arms, whose hands still grasped the sickle (despite the brown babies set astride their hips!). A group which waylaid me to ask why the *Hugoos* (my husband, the district magistrate) had not sent for *them* to inquire of the crops and the oxen, since they knew quite as much about the welfare and work of the village as the men!

Is it not to cast an unmerited slur on the lives of women like these (and there are millions of women as free to come and go, to labor beside their men-folk, to speak to strangers, as these Jâtins were), to say they are not fit for such freedom? As a matter of fact, fully one-half of the women of India have such freedom without suffering the least moral deterioration thereby. My experience is that the gad-about women lead more moral lives than the secluded ones. That this is, in a measure, due to the more healthy and natural tone of country, as distinct from town, life—for strict seclusion is a thing of cities—is no doubt true; but, as their own saying, "the gad-about's virtue has no screen between it and the truth," points out, the mere fact of publicity necessitates circumspection. And though the record of criminality in our police courts is against the unsecluded women, this has to be largely discounted by the fact that the veil hides from the public ken vice as well as virtue!

If, then, Indian society in the upper or secluded classes is not fit for the freedom already enjoyed by their sisters in the lower ones, so much the worse for the upper classes! Personally, however, I cannot consent to throw such wholesale doubt on the moral strength of secluded women, though no one who has lived in a Zanana, even for twenty-four consecutive hours, can fail to feel how utterly demoralizing the atmosphere is, and must be.

Given, however, this sweeping assertion of unfitness for freedom, it is not surprising to find its corollary in the line of policy laid down by the admirable fund which bears Lady Dufferin's name; that it should "respect to the very uttermost all the laws which govern the *purdah*."*

*Purdah, literally a screen used to denote seclusion. Thus it is said of a woman: "She is *purdah-nishin*," literally, sitting in a screen.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, apart from the unmerited slur which I have mentioned, the implied assumption here is that such respect is necessary to the welfare of the work; and this gives an absolutely false impression to the general public. As a matter of fact, if not one single secluded woman were treated, the task of the charity would still be far beyond its present strength. We should not, of course, be giving medical aid to secluded women, but we should be giving it to women who need it to the full as much. There are some, myself among the number, who hold that this would be better, since we should run less risk of unnecessary temporizing with a system which is in itself responsible for half the physical ailments we have to treat in the zananas; who think that, by so treating them, we not only spend time and money in perpetuating a vicious circle of error, but also lose the strongest fulcrum we have against the dead weight of a vicious custom—the strongest because it is always the one nature uses—the fulcrum of pain.

But that is another story. And I will pass on to a further false impression which is given by the words quoted above, namely that the system of seclusion has been, as it were, acquitted by experts of any active responsibility for the crying evils of Indian social life; since, otherwise, toleration could scarcely be the keynote of our desire to do good.

But this is not the case. No one, as I have said before, who has lived even for four and twenty consecutive hours in the ordinary atmosphere of an ordinary zanana, can fail to see its inevitable effect upon the children who are brought up in it. Briefly, this drawing of a veil between womanhood and the lustful eyes of the world makes it impossible for the children to be blind. Nor is this surprising. It does not need a doctor to tell us how the exclusion of all interests save one, the concentration of the whole mind on but one function, is invariably followed by a marked development in that interest, that function.

And in the zanana the underlying assumption that the claims of sex are paramount, finds expression in almost every detail of life. It is the *stri achchar*, or "woman's tradition," which is practically responsible for child marriage, as it is undoubtedly for the thousand and one unmentionable rites and ceremonies which, aped as they naturally are by the unsecluded classes—since gentility is always aped—make the whole subject seem so revolting to English women.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet there is no reason why this should be so; for no higher ideal of marriage exists than that inculcated by the Hindoo religion; though not, alas! by the average Hindoo woman.

This is not merely the expression of my own opinion. Bahoo Mohin Chander Sen writes that it is "the mother, the mother-in-law and the female relations generally, who combine to force the child into premature marriage;" and most native gentlemen will admit that this is the case and that they are helpless before the *stri achchar*, though they will admit it with reluctance. But if further proof of the fact that women are all powerful on this point is needed, it may be found in the absolute impotence of even educated natives to break through its fetters at the time of the agitation concerning the Age of Consent Bill. It was purely pitiable. It was then that I began to suspect that seclusion was responsible for immature marriage and the ever-increasing ritual —born of woman's idle and morbid imaginings—which has grown up around it. Of this ritual the men speak with assumed contempt but with real awe; for they know that, so long as a woman's life finds its sole interest in itself, the *stri achchar* will remain strong enough even to upset an Act of Parliament—as, virtually, it has, since the Age of Consent Bill is absolutely a dead letter. Personally, I never came across a woman who was even aware of its existence, and my insistence on it has only provoked a contemptuous amusement.

But the *stri achchar* does more than this. It defies nature. It disperses the mist with which she wisely shrouds the great problem of sex until the solver's foot hovers on the edge of it.

And it is this fact which makes child marriage possible. For it *is* possible to an Indian child who has been taught to play in deadly earnest at marrying her doll, to lisp curses on anyone who shall supplant her in her husband's desire, and to look forward to her womanhood as to a festival of pleasure. This is my quarrel with seclusion. It prevents nature from rearing her children in the happy normal state of ignorance in which she rears all young things up to a certain point; it makes it impossible for her to take her own way, unchecked, yet unforced. And this is the reason why the general impression that seclusion is universal, that it is impossible to work for the women of India if we refuse it respect to the uttermost, that for the sake of either physical or mental comfort it is necessary to tolerate it, seems to me productive of so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much harm. Personally, I deprecate any exotic sympathy with the sorrows and sufferings of seclusion which will tend to prolong its life, because I believe it to be entirely responsible for nearly all the social difficulties of India. Of course, now-a-days, physical pain is held to be the only unmitigated wrong; but, even from this point of view, it is possible that a lesser pain, long drawn out, holds as much pure martyrdom to the individual as a shorter, more severe one.

Of course, it is quite impracticable to tilt at seclusion as if it were a windmill; on the other hand, I do think that many of the Western women who are doing so much in India yield to its claims far too easily. Take, for instance, the case of girls' schools. I have had, in a professional capacity, to examine them by hundreds, and nothing has amused me more than the ever-varying claims for conveyance and chaperonage to and from the school, on the ground of pupils being secluded; claims which, in every case, mean the spending of public money. In my own schools, I let it be known that I would pay for neither, and I never suffered from any lack of pupils; but, of course, the mere fact that I insisted on religious instruction in its own faith being given in each school, whether Hindoo, Sikh, or Mohammedan, made such a stand possible.

Naturally, also, the old problem as to which came first, the owl or the egg, makes it difficult to decide whether we are not justified in tolerating the results in order to attack the cause. Lady Dufferin says that "most English ladies who interest themselves in ameliorating the condition of their Indian sisters. . . . have ultimate designs on the *purdah;*" and she is right. But I am not sure how far what I may call a constructive denial of their aim is permissible. No good fight was ever fought under a false flag.

One thing seems to me certain, the impossibility of effecting any radical change, such as was attempted in the Age of Consent Bill, until we get rid of the women's apartments. Mr. Mohun Ghose believes the Government strong enough to legislate on the marriageable age of all Her Majesty's subjects. So it is; but the *stri achchar* is strong enough to defy legislation.

At the same time, I think it is possible to make our own position in regard to the results of this woman's tradition as to marriage more free of blame than it is, by the simple expedient

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of treating a betrothal contract in our courts exactly as we treat any other contract. I can conceive of no reason why it should not be included in the list of all other contracts between minors, as not cognizable under the code, so that no dispute arising out of it could be referred to our courts. The objection that this would not affect existing custom appreciably, if it were the only disability—if the betrothal or marriage were to be considered ratified on the attainment of legal age without such dispute—appears to me a point in its favor. It means nothing drastic.

Nevertheless, since the credit and consequent value of a contract depends entirely on the certainty of its fulfilment, the impossibility of enforcing such fulfilment would, if it did nothing else, certainly tend to shorten the period during which evasion was possible. And this must tend to bring the date of betrothal closer to the age at which it can be legally ratified. Which is exactly what we want. In addition, we should throw the *onus* of coercion on the religious and social beliefs which are supposed to enjoin the existing custom; which, again, is also desirable. This policy, too, has its sanction. "Ye have a law, see ye to it."

F. A. STEEL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LITERARY MOVEMENT IN IRELAND.

BY W. B. YEATS.

I HAVE just come to a quiet Connaught house from seeing a movement of thought, which may do much to fashion the dreams of the next generation in Ireland, grow to a sudden maturity. Certain plays, which are an expression of the most characteristic ideals of what is sometimes called "the Celtic movement," have been acted in Dublin before audiences drawn from all classes and all political sections, and described at such length in every Nationalist newspaper, that the people in the cottages here in this quiet place are talking about them over the fire. Whatever be the merit of these plays, and that must be left to the judgment of time, their success means, as I think, that the "Celtic movement," which has hitherto interested but a few cultivated people, is about to become a part of the thought of Ireland.

Before 1891, Unionists and Nationalists were too busy keeping one or two simple beliefs at their fullest intensity for any complexity of thought or emotion; and the national imagination uttered itself, with a somewhat uncertain energy, in a few stories and in many ballads about the need of unity against England, about the martyrs who had died at the hand of England, or about the greatness of Ireland before the coming of England. They built up Ireland's dream of Ireland, of an ideal country weighed down by immemorial sorrows and served by heroes and saints; and they taught generations of young men to love their country with a love that was the deepest emotion they were ever to know; but they built with the virtues and beauties and sorrows and hopes that would move to tears the greatest number of those eyes before whom the modern world is but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beginning to unroll itself; and, except when some rare, personal impulse shaped the song according to its will, they built to the formal and conventional rhythm which would give the most immediate pleasure to ears that have forgotten Gaelic poetry, and have not yet learned the subtleties of English poetry. The writers who made this literature or who shaped its ideals, in the years before the great famine, lived at the moment when the middle class had brought to perfection its ideal of the good citizen, and of a politics and a philosophy and a literature which would help him upon his way; and they made a literature full of the civic virtues, and, in all but its unbounded patriotism, without inconvenient ardors. They took their style from Scott and Campbell and Macaulay, and that "universally popular" poetry which is really the poetry of the middle class, and from Beranger and that "peasant poetry" which looks for its models to the Burns of "Highland Mary" and "The Cottar's Saturday night." Here and there a poet or a story-writer found an older dream among the common people or in his own mind, and made a personality for himself; and got shoved away and forgotten; for everybody wanted to be moved by the same emotions as everybody else; and nobody who understands how much self-sacrifice is the shadow of their desire will blame it.

II.

The fall of Parnell and the wreck of his party and of the organizations that supported it, were the symbols, if not the causes, of a sudden change. They were followed by movements and organizations that brought the ideas and the ideals which are the expression of personalities into Irish political, economic and literary interests. Those who looked for the old energies, which were the utterance of the common will and hope, were unable to see that a new kind of Ireland, as full of energy as a boiling pot, was rising up amid the wreck of the old kind, and that the national life was finding a new utterance. May be, the hand that broke the ball of glass, that now lies in fragments full of a new iridescent life, obeyed some impulse from beyond its wild and capricious will. More books about Irish subjects have been published in these last eight years than in the thirty years that went before them, and these books have the care for scholarship and the precision of speech which had been notor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

iously lacking in books on Irish subjects. An appeal to the will, a habit of thought which measures all beliefs by their intensity, is content with a strenuous rhetoric; but an appeal to the intellect needs an always more perfect knowledge, an always more malleable speech. The new writers and the organizations they work through—for organizations of various kinds take the place held by the critical press in other countries—have awakened Irish affections among many from whom the old rhetoric could never have got a hearing, but they have been decried as weakening the national faith by lovers of the old rhetoric. I have seen an obscure Irish member of Parliament rise at one of those monthly meetings of the Irish Literary Society when the members of the society read their poems to one another, and ask leave to read a poem. He did not belong to the society, but leave was given him, and he read a poem in the old manner, blaming the new critics and praising the old poems which had made him patriotic and filled his imagination with the images of the martyrs, and, as he numbered over their names, Wolfe Tone, Emmet, Owen Roe, Sarsfield, his voice shook and many were angry with the new critics.

The organizations that are making this change are the Irish Literary Society in London, the National Literary Society in Dublin, which has just founded the Irish Literary Theatre, and the Feis Ceoil Committee in Dublin, at whose annual series of concerts of Irish music, singers and pipers from all parts of Ireland compete; and the Gaelic League, which has worked for the revival of the Gaelic language with such success that it has sold fifty thousand of its Gaelic text books in a year. All these organizations have been founded since the fall of Parnell; and all are busy in preserving, or in moulding anew, and without any thought of the politics of the hour, some utterance of the national life, and in opposing the vulgar books and the music-hall songs, that keep pouring in from England. All but the Gaelic League, which considers language and nationality inseparable, use the English language, preparing, as some think, for a day when Ireland will speak in Gaelic, almost as much as Wales speaks in Welsh, within her borders, but speak in English to other nations of those truths which were committed to her when "He set the borders of the nations according to His angels;" and, as it seems, believing that the use of English, now it has become the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

language of so different countries, need no more make Irishmen think like Englishmen than did the use of Latin make the lettered classes of the Middle Ages think like Romans. But this is a dispute which concerns ourselves principally; for what concerns others is that a new kind of romance, a new element in thought, is being perhaps moulded out of Irish life and traditions, and that this element may have an importance for criticism, even should criticism forget the writers who are trying to embody it in their work, while looking each one through his own color in the dome of many-colored glass.

III.

Contemporary English literature takes delight in praising England and her Empire, the master-work and dream of the middle class; and, though it may escape from this delight, it must long continue to utter the ideals of the strong and wealthy. Irish intellect has always been pre-occupied with the weak and with the poor, and now it has begun to collect and describe their music and stories, and to utter anew the beliefs and hopes which they alone remember. It may never make a literature pre-occupied with the circumstance of their lives, like the "peasant poetry," whose half deliberate trivality, passionless virtue and passionless vice has helped so many orderly lives; for a writer who wishes to write with his whole mind must knead the beliefs and hopes, which he has made his own, with the circumstance of his own life. Burns had this pre-occupation, and nobody will deny that he was a great poet; but even he had the poverty of emotions and ideas of a peasantry that had lost, like the middle class into which it would have its children absorbed, the imagination that is in tradition without finding the imagination that is in books. Irish literature may prolong its first inspiration without renouncing the complexity of ideas and emotions which is the inheritance of cultivated men, for it will have learned from the discoveries of modern learning that the common people, wherever civilization has not driven its plough too deep, keep a watch over the roots of all religion and all romance. Their poetry trembles upon the verge of incoherence with a passion unknown among our poets, and their sense of beauty exhausts itself in countless legends and in metaphors that seem to mirror the energies of nature.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Hyde has collected much old Irish peasant love-poetry, and, like all primitive poetry, it foreshadows the unmeasured emotion, the ideal passion, of poetry whose intensity of emotion, or strangeness of language, has made it the poetry of little coteries. His peasant lover cries:

"It is happy for you, O blind man, who do not see much of women.
O! if you were to see what I see, you would be sick even as I am.
It is a pity, O God, that it was not blind I was before I saw her twisted hair.
I always thought the blind were pitiable, until my calamity grew beyond the grief of all,
Then though it is a pity I turned my pity into envy.
In a loop of the loops in a loop am I.
It is sorrow for whoever has seen her, and it is sorrow for him who does not see her every day.
It is sorrow for him who is tied in the knot of her love, and it is sorrow for him who is loosed out of it.
It is sorrow for him who is near her, and it is sorrow for him who is not near her."

Or, he cries:

"O, Maurya! you are my love, and the love of my heart is your love—
Love that is without littleness, without weakness,
Love from age till death,
Love growing out of folly,
Love that will send me close beneath the clay,
Love without a hope of the world,
Love without envy of fortune,
Love that has left me withered in captivity,
Love of my heart beyond women;
And a love such as that, it is seldom to be got from any man."

Or, he cries:

"My love, O, she is my love,
The woman who is most for destroying me,
Dearer is she for making me ill than the woman who would be for making me well.

She is my treasure, O she is my treasure,
The woman of the gray eyes.
A woman who would not lay a hand under my head.

She is my love, O she is my love,
The woman who left no strength in me;
A woman who would not breathe a sigh after me,
A woman who would not raise a stone at my tomb.

She is my secret love, O she is my secret love.
A woman who tells me nothing.
A woman who does not remember me to be out.

She is my choice, O she is my choice,
The woman who would not look back at me,
The woman who would not make peace with me.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

She is my desire, O she is my desire:
A woman dearest to me under the sun,
A woman who would not pay me heed if I were to sit by her side.
It is she ruined my heart and left a sigh for ever in me."

All are not like *this*, but the most inspired and, as I think, the most characteristic are like this. There is a square stone tower called Ballylee Castle, a couple of miles from where I am writing. A farmer called Hynes, who had a beautiful daughter, Mary Hynes, lived near it some sixty years ago; and, all over the country side, songs are still sung in her honor, and old men and old women still talk of her beauty. The songs are not very good, for Gaelic poetry has fallen from its old greatness, but they come out of the same dreams as the songs and legends—as vague, it may be, as the clouds of evening and of dawn, that became in Homer's mind the memory and the prophecy of all the sorrows that have beset and shall beset the journey of beauty in the world. A very old woman who remembers her said to me, and to a friend who was with me, "I never saw one so handsome as she was, and I never will until I die. There were people coming from all parts to look at her, and maybe some of them forgot to say, 'God bless her.'* Any way, she was young when she died, and my mother was at her funeral, and as to whether she was taken, well, there's others have been taken that were not handsome at all, and so its likely enough she might have been, for there is no one to be seen at all that is handsome like she was." The old woman sang us a song, too, that Raftery, a famous poet in his time, made in Irish, and it told how he had met her on the road, and after that "travelled the hills and the mountains of Ireland, but could never see one that was like her," and that "it would take a thousand clerks to write down all her ways!" The spirit of Helen moves indeed among the legends that are told about turf-fires, and among the legends of the poor and simple everywhere. A friend of mine was told awhile ago, in a remote part of Donegal, of a young man who saw a light before him on the road, and found when he came near that it was from a lock of hair in an open box. The hair was so bright that, when he went into the stable where he slept, he put the box into a hole in the wall and had no need of a candle. After many wanderings

*They should have said "God bless her," so that their admiration might not give the faeries power over her.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he found her, from whose head it had been taken, and after many adventures married her and reigned over a kingdom.

The peasant remembers such songs and legends, all the more, it may be, because he has thought of little but cows and sheep and the like in his own marriage, for his dream has never been entangled by reality. The beauty of women is mirrored in his mind, as the excitement of the world is mirrored in the minds of children, and like them he thinks nothing but the best worth remembering. The child William Blake said to somebody, who had told him of a fine city, that he thought no city fine that had not walls of gold and silver. It may be that poetry is the utterance of desires that we can only satisfy in dreams, and that, if all our dreams were satisfied, there would be no more poetry. Dreams pass from us with childhood, because we are so often told they can never come true; and because we are taught with so much labor to admire the paler beauty of the world. The children of the poor and simple learn from their unbroken religious faith, and by their traditional beliefs, and by the hardness of their lives, that this world is nothing, and that a spiritual world, where all dreams come true, is everything; and therefore the poor and simple are that imperfection whose perfection is genius. The most of us think that all things, when imagined in their perfection, that all the images which emotion desires in its intensity, are among the things nobody has ever seen or shall ever see; and so we are always reminding one another not to go too far from the moderation of reality.

But the Irish peasant believes that the utmost he can dream was once or still is a reality by his own door. He will point to some mountain and tell you that some famous hero or beauty lived and sorrowed there, or he will tell you that *Tir-nan-og*, the country of the young, the old Celtic paradise, the Land of the Living Heart, as it used to be called, is all about him. An old woman close by Ballylee Castle said to a friend of mine the other day, when someone had finished a story of the poet Usheen's return from Tir-nan-og, where he had lived with his fairy mistress: "Tir-nan-og? That place is not far from us. One time I was in the chapel of Labane, and there was a tall thin man sitting next to me, and he dressed in gray; and after the mass I asked him where he came from. 'From Tir-nan-og,' said he.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'And where is that?' I asked him. 'It's not far from you,' he said. 'It's near the place where you live.' I remember well the look of him, and he telling me that. The priest was looking at us while we were talking together."

There are many grotesque things near at hand, the dead doing their penance in strange shapes, and evil spirits with terrible and ugly shapes, but people of a perfect beauty are never far off; and this beauty is often, I know not how often, that heroic beauty "which changes least from youth to age," and which has faded from modern painting and poetry before a fleeting voluptuous beauty. One old Mayo woman, who can neither read nor write, described it to me, though with grotesque comparisons. She has been long in service, and her language has not the simplicity of those who live among fields. She was standing in the window of her master's house, looking out toward a mountain where Queen Maeve, the Queen of the Western Spirits, is said to have been buried, when she saw "the finest woman you ever saw" travelling right across from the mountain and straight to her. The woman had a sword by her side and a dagger lifted up in her hand, and was dressed in white, with bare arms and feet. She looked "very strong and warry and fierce, but not wicked;" that is, not cruel, at all. The old woman had seen the Irish giant, and "though he was a fine man, he was nothing to this woman, for he was round, and could not have stepped out so soldierly." "She was like Mrs. ———," naming a stately lady of the neighborhood, "but she had no stomach on her and was slight and broad in the shoulders, and was handsomer than anyone you ever saw now; she looked about thirty." The old woman covered her eyes with her hands, and when she uncovered them the apparition had vanished. The neighbors were "wild" with her for not waiting to see if there was a message, for they are sure it was Queen Maeve, who often shows herself to the pilots. I asked the old woman if she had seen others like Queen Maeve, and she said: "Some of them have their hair down, but they look quite different, like the sleepy-looking ladies you see in the papers. Those with their hair up are like this one. The others have long white dresses, but those with their hair up have short dresses so that you can see their legs right up to the calf." After some careful questioning I found that they wore what appeared to be buskins. She went on: "They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are fine and dashing-looking, like the men one sees riding their horses in twos and threes on the slopes of the mountains, with their swords swinging." She repeated over and over, "There is no such race living now, none so fine proportioned," or the like, and then said: "The present queen is a nice, pleasant-looking woman, but she is not like her. What makes me think so little of the ladies is that I see none as they be," meaning the spirits; "when I think of her and of the ladies now, they are like little children running about, without being able to put their clothes on right. Is it the ladies? Why, I would not call them women at all!"

There are many old heroical tales about Queen Maeve, and before she was a queen she was a goddess and had her temples, and she is still the most beautiful of the beautiful. A young man among the Burren hills of Clare told me, a couple of years ago, that he remembered an old poet who had made his poems in Irish, and had met in his youth one who had called herself Queen Maeve, and asked him if he would have money or pleasure. He said he would have pleasure, and she gave him her love for a time, and then went from him and ever after he was very sad. The young man had often heard him sing a lamentation he had made, but could only remember that it was "very mournful" and called her "Beauty of all Beauty."

Many, perhaps most, of those that I have talked with of these things have all their worldly senses, but those who have most knowledge of these things, so much that they are permitted, it is thought, to speak but broken words, are those from whom the earthly senses have fallen away. "In every household" of the spirits even, there is "a queen and a fool, and, maybe, the fool is the wisest of all." This fool, who is held to wander in lonely places and to bewitch men out of the world—for the touch of the queen and of the fool are deadly—is the type of that old wisdom from which the good citizen and the new wisdom have led the world away, forgetting that "the ruins of time build mansions in eternity." The poetry that comes out of the old wisdom must turn always to religion and to the law of the hidden world, while the poetry of the new wisdom must not forget politics and the law of the visible world; and between these poetries there cannot be any lasting peace. Those that follow the old wisdom must not shrink too greatly from the journey de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scribed in some verses which Miss Hopper, the latest poet of our school,* has put into the mouth of Dalua, the faery fool:

> "The world wears on to sundown, and love is lost or won,
> But he recks not of loss or gain, the King of Ireland's son.
> He follows on for ever when all your chase is done,
> He follows after shadows, the King of Ireland's son."

Alone among nations, Ireland has in her written Gaelic literature, in her old love tales and battle tales, the forms in which the imagination of Europe uttered itself before Greece shaped the tumult of legend into her music of the arts; and she can discover, from the beliefs and emotions of her common people, the habit of mind that created the religion of the muses. The legends of other European countries are less numerous, and not so full of the energies from which the arts and our understanding of their sanctity arose, and the best of them have already been shaped into plays and poems. The Celt, as it seems, created romance, when his stories of Arthur and of the Grail became for a time almost the only inspiration of European literature, and it would not be wonderful if he should remould romance after its most ancient image, now that he is recovering his ancient possessions.

IV.

The movement of thought which has made the good citizen, or has been made by him, has surrounded us with comfort and safety, and with vulgarity and insincerity. Churches which have substituted a system of morals for spiritual ardor; pictures which have substituted conventionally pretty faces for the disquieting revelations of sincerity; poets who have set the praises of those things good citizens think praiseworthy above a dangerous delight in beauty for the sake of beauty, are a part of its energy and its weariness. The Romantic movement from the times of Blake and Shelley and Keats, when it took a new form, has been battling with the thoughts of the good citizen, as moss and ivy and grass battle with some old building, crumbling its dead stone and mortar into the living greenery of earth. The disorders of a Shelley, or a French romanticist of our own time, in art, and in their lives that mirror their art, may be but a too impetuous ardor of battle, a too swift leaping of ivy or of grass

*The reader will find, in the collection of recent poems by Miss Hopper which immediately follows this article, a most attractive illustration of the theme discussed by Mr. Yeats in such an interesting manner.—EDITOR N. A. R.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to window ledge or gable end; and the intensity and strangeness of a painting by Rossetti or by Watts is but a sudden falling of stones. Moss and ivy and grass gather against stone and mortar in unceasing enmity, for, while the old is crumbling, the new is building; and the Romantic movement will never have perfect victory unless, as mystics have thought, the golden age is to come again, and men's hearts and the weather to grow gentle as time fades into eternity. Blake said that all art was a labor to bring that golden age, and we call romantic art romantic because it has made that age's light dwell in the imaginations of a little company of studious persons.

Because the greater number of persons are too busy with the work of the world to forget the light of the sun, romantic art is, as I think, about to change its manner and become more like the art of the old poets, who saw the golden age and their own age side by side like substance and shadow. Ever since Christianity turned men's minds to Judea, and learning turned them to Greece and Rome, the sanctity has dwindled from their own hills and valleys, which the legends and beliefs of fifty centuries had filled so full of it that a man could hardly plough his fields or follow his sheep upon the hillside without remembering some august story, or walking softly lest he had divine companions. When the valleys and the hills had almost become clay and stone, the good citizens plucked up their heart and took possession of the world and filled it with their little compact thoughts; and romance fled to more and more remote fairylands, and forgot that it was ever more than an old tale which nobody believes. But now we are growing interested in our own countries, and discovering that the common people in all countries that have not given themselves up to the improvements and devices of good citizens, which we call civilization, still half understand the sanctity of their hills and valleys; and at the same time a change of thought is making us half ready to believe with Ecclesiasticus that "all things are made double one above another," and that the forms of nature may be temporal shadows of realities.

In a little time, places may begin to seem the only hierographs that cannot be forgotten, and poets to remember that they will come the nearer the old poets, who had a seat at every hearth, if they mingle their own dream with a story told for centuries of some mountain, that casts its shadows upon many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doors, and if they understand that the beauty they celebrate is a part of the paradise men's eyes shall look upon when they close upon the world. The paradise of the Christian, as those who think more of the order of communities than of the nature of things have shaped it, is but the fulfilment of one dream; but the paradise that the common people tell of about the fire, and still half understand, is the fulfilment of all dreams, and opens its gates as gladly to the perfect lover as to the perfect saint, and only he who understands it can lift romance into prophecy and make beauty holy. Their paradise, Tir-nan-og, the Land of the Living Heart, the Grass Green Island of Apples, call it what you will, created that religion of the muses which gave the arts to the world; and those countries whose traditions are fullest of it and of the sanctity of places, may yet remould romance till it has become a covenant between intellectual beauty and the beauty of the world. We cannot know how many these countries are, until the new science of folklore and the almost new science of mythology have done their work; but Ireland, if she can awake again the but half forgotten legends of Slieve Gullion, or of Cruachmagh, or of the hill where Maive is buried, and make them an utterance of that desire to be at rest amid ideal perfection, which is becoming conscious in the minds of poets as the good citizen wins the priests over to his side; or if she can make us believe that the beautiful things that move us to awe, white lilies among dim shadows, windy twilights over gray sands, dewy and silent places among hazel trees by still waters, are in truth, and not in phantasy alone, the symbols, or the dwellings, of immortal presences, she will have begun a change that, whether it is begun in our time, or not for centuries, will some day make all lands holy lands again.

V.

Ireland has no great wealth, no pre-occupation with successful persons to turn her writer's eyes to any lesser destiny. Even the poetry which had its form and much of its matter from alien thought dwelt, as the Gaelic ballads had done before it, on ideas living in the perfection of hope, on visions of unfulfilled desire, and not on the sordid compromise of success. The popular poetry of England celebrates her victories, but the popular poetry of Ireland remembers only defeats and defeated persons. A

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ballad that is in every little threepenny and sixpenny ballad book, asks if Ireland has no pride in her Lawrences and Wellingtons, and answers that these belong to the Empire and not to Ireland, whose "heart beats high" for men who died in exile or in prison; and this ballad is a type of all. The popular poetry, too, has made love of the earth of Ireland so much a part of her literature, that it should not be a hard thing to fill it with the holiness of places. Politics are, indeed, the forge in which nations are made, and the smith has been so long busy making Ireland according to His will, that she may well have some important destiny. But, whether this is so or not, whether this destiny is to make her in the arts, as she is in politics, a voice of the idealism of the common people, who still remember the dawn of the world, or to give her an unforeseen history, it can but express the accidents and energies of her past, and criticism does its natural work in trying to prophesy this expression; and, even if it is mistaken, a prophecy is not always made all untrue by being unfulfilled. A few years will decide if the writers of Ireland are to shape themselves in our time for the fulfilment of this prophecy, for need and much discussion will bring a new national agreement, and the political tumult will awake again.

W. B. YEATS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"A CAROL OF BIRDS" AND OTHER POEMS.

BY NORA HOPPER.

A CAROL OF BIRDS.

Little Christ in the winter
Opened first His eyes;
Saw a star above His bed,
Shining near His mother's head;
Saw the frosty skies
Full of angels, singing slow,
Singing low
Lullabies.

Little Christ in the summer
Made a pretty play,
Shaping doves and sparrows
Out of wetted clay;
Bade each lift a living wing
In the sunshine, preen and sing,
Gladdening
Soar and fly away.

Little Christ in the autumn,
With the passing birds,
Sang a song of wondering
Sweet beyond all musicking
Holpen out with words.
Leading with a quiet pace
To the trodden drinking-place
The day-weary herds.

Little Christ in the spring-time
Found a ruined nest,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And so sweet a prayer He prayed
That the gentle Father bade
A dead robin live again,
That her cold eggs might be made
Singing creatures free and fain,
Unafraid.

Little Christ a-sleeping
Fell and dreamed a dream.
Birds of feather and of clay
At the dying of the day
Came and sang to Him.
Sparrows chirped a merry note,
But one mother-robin's throat
Shrilled of death and holy rood.
Was it ill or was it good,
Such a dream ?

THE FAERY FOOL.

If I'm the Faery fool, Dalua—
Ay me, the Faery fool !
How do I know what the rushes say,
Sighing and shuddering all the day
Over their shadowy pool ?
How do I know what the North Wind cries
Herding his flocks of snow ?
The menace that lies in the Hunter's eyes
How do I know ?

If I'm the Faery fool, Dalua—
Ay me, the Faery fool !
I cry to them that sent me here
To laugh and jest, to geck and fleer,
To scorn at law and rule :
" Why did ye also give to me
Beauty and peace to know,
The ears to hear and the eyes to see
And the hands that let all go ? "

I cry to them that bade me jest :
" Why made ye me so slight,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And put a heart within my breast,
An evil gift, an evil guest,
To spoil me for delight?
Made for mere laughter, answer why
Must I have eyes for dool?
Take from me tears, or let me die,
For I am sick of wisdom, I,
Dalua, the Faery fool."

NIAM.

Mouth of the rose and hair like a cloud—
After my feet the wind grows loud:
The red East Wind whose rumor has gone
From Tir-nan-Og* to Tir-na-Tonn.†
Under my feet the windflower grows,
After my feet the shadows run,
Over my feet the long grass blows.
All things hail me and call me on
Out of the darkness into the sun,
Love and Beauty and Youth in one.

Under my feet the windflower grows.
Men called me Niam when first arose
My splendid star: but what now ye call
Me, do I heed if I hear at all?
Look in my eyes—are they gray or blue?
They are the eyes that the Fenians knew,
When out of the sunshine, into the shade,
I called to Oisin, and he obeyed.
Across Fionn's banner my dark hair flew,
And safe in its leash my love I drew.

I called to Oisin and he obeyed—
Out of the sunshine into the shade,
Though the words were out and the warhorns blew
And wisdom and pride my voice gainsaid.
But a hundred years, or a thousand years,
I kept my lover from hopes and fears—
In Druid dark on my arm he slept.
Shall I not keep men even as I kept?

* The Country of Youth. † The Land under the Sea.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Twixt a man and his wisdom let blow my hair,
The man is beside me, and wisdom's—where ?

The Fenians died and the high Gods die,
But spring's immortal, and so am I.
I am young, I am swift, I am fair to see,
My blood is the sap running new in the tree.
Shall I not keep men even as I kept
Oisin free from his falling sept ?
Who shall deny me, or who gainsay,
For the world is beginning anew to-day ?
Youth is glad, for the world is wide ;
Tarry, O Youth ! Love is here at thy side.

The world is beginning anew to-day ;
Fire is awake in each clod of clay ;
The ragweeds know what has never been told
By the old to the young, or the young to the old.
The hawthorns tell it in broad daylight ;
The evening primrose awaits the night,
Her beautiful secret she shuts in close
Till the last late bee goes home from the rose.
And I am the secret, the flower, and the tree ;
I am Beauty ; O Youth, I have blossomed for thee.

THE WEAVER.

I weave life upwards through the grass,
I weave death downwards through the mould.
Before the ordered stars I was :
Before my eyes the flowers pass ;
The seed, the cup of living gold,
The bulb, the blossom white and cold.
All life within my hands I hold,
All death and change my fingers fold.
My looms are full, my shuttles fly,
The weaver and the weft am I.

I keep all secrets ; I disclose
Wonder of sweetness to the rose.
I fill the dandelion's stem

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With milk; I give the maidenhair
A gift not sweet, and ill to bear—
The gift of weakness. Here I bid
The lily in the dark be hid
From all her kin; and yonder I
Quicken harsh rue and rosemary.
Blossom and bud and seed are mine,
All bear my sigil and my sign,
They are of me, and I of them.

I weave death downwards through the mould,
And weave life upwards through the grass.
And which is best I know not—I—
Which gift were best to sell or buy
If life and death were bought or sold.
Sad hours are lavished, glad hours doled;
Buyers and sellers come and pass;
Some, warm with love; and some, acold;
Some, with sealed eyes; and some behold
Through their own tears, as in a glass,
Me and my weaving. Black and gold,
Ash-gray, rose-red—all colors flow
One with another, to and fro,
As endlessly my shuttles go.
I was before the stars began,
Or God had ever thought of man,
And with the stars I grow not old.
I weave life upwards through the grass,
And weave death downwards through the mould.

NORA HOPPER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HIGHWAYS OF THE PEOPLE.

BY HUGH H. LUSK.

As commerce is the essential condition of national wealth, so it may be said, with equal truth, that effective transportation is the essential condition of successful commerce. No amount of patient industry on the part of a people can avail to make the community wealthy, except under conditions that render commerce safe and easy. No amount of natural riches in a country has ever availed to make its commerce great, or its industries widely profitable to its inhabitants, without the assistance of some system of transportation generally available to its people. The history of the United States, compared with that of Russia or of China during the past century, serves to illustrate the extent to which this is true.

In their natural conditions, Russia and China bear more resemblance to the United States than any other country. Both are of great extent, embracing a great variety of climates; both are wealthy in vegetable and mineral treasures; and both contain large populations of exceedingly industrious inhabitants. The physical features of both countries have also much in common with those of the United States. China, particularly, resembles the middle section of the continent of North America, in the possession of not a few great navigable rivers, which offer themselves as the most easy means of transportation for the people and the products of the country. Yet, experience has shown that, both in Russia and in China, the increase of wealth has been slow—so slow, indeed, as hardly to have affected the condition of the mass of the people at all; while in the United States the increase of commerce and the accumulation of wealth have exceeded anything of which the world has elsewhere had any experience. This has not been due to greater natural riches

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of soil or climate in the United States, because there is no evidence that, in either respect, this country has any advantage over China, or much, if any, over the greater part of inhabited Russia. There is no reasonable ground for attributing it to greater mineral treasures in America, for these are believed to be immense both in Russia and China, though, as yet, very little developed. It certainly has not been occasioned by greater industry and diligence on the part of the people, because no more patiently industrious populations exist than the millions of Russia and China, and, especially in the latter country, the inhabitants are ingenious as well as diligent.

The secret of the startling contrast between these countries, in their development and in the increase of their wealth during the past century, is to be found in their respective facilities for transportation. Had America depended on her coastal trade and her rivers for opening up the country and for developing its commerce, the energy of her people would undoubtedly have made itself felt, but the results must have been vastly less than those we see around us. A strip along the Atlantic shore, perhaps another along the Pacific coast, the valleys through which navigable rivers find their way to the ocean or to the Great Lakes, would have constituted the largely productive districts of the country. Outside of these boundaries, settlers might, indeed, have lived, and in a degree they might have succeeded in developing commerce; but the development would have been slow, and wealth would have been accumulated in a deliberate fashion. Canals would have done something here, as they have done something in China, to provide for the needs of commerce, but, in the very nature of things, it must have been little. America has owed her phenomenal progress, and the unprecedented increase of her wealth as a country, to her system of railroad transportation. Without this the country could not have been occupied; her great inland centres of commerce and manufacture could not have been created; without it, in a word, the end of the century would have found her still a nation of the second rank, in population and in wealth.

So far it cannot be questioned that the energy and enterprise of the capitalists to whom this country owes its great systems of railroads have been of immense service to the country and to its people. It is another question how far these services may have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been discounted by the price paid for them by the people; or how far experience, in America and elsewhere, supports the idea that the method hitherto pursued in the United States is the best and most economical for the future. It cannot be questioned that this question is taking a leading place in the list of the economic problems of the end of the century, and it is one which must be discussed, if any intelligent answer to it is to be obtained, or any reasonable basis established for an economic policy for the coming years.

The record of railroad construction in America is a remarkable one, and it is very naturally pointed to as the most convincing proof of the excellence of the system which has been pursued here, and of the policy which has sustained it. No other system than that of private construction and ownership, it is confidently asserted, could have accomplished for America and her people what has been accomplished by private speculation and private ownership of railroads in the last fifty years; and if this has been so in the past, why should any change be made in the future? Why should not the highways of the people, equipped with rails and provided with traction power, everywhere take the place of the old-world highways, on which every individual laboriously dragged his own produce with his own team? It is true that, by such a policy, the right of each individual to use his own team would practically be limited, but it would be for his own good and for the benefit of his neighbors.

To this line of argument there are two replies, each of which is sufficiently important to entitle it to more than a cursory examination. In the first place, it is alleged that, however great the benefits of railroad construction may have been to the people of America, there is no evidence that they could not have been equally well obtained without the intervention of the private capitalist; and that, however excellent the management of the railroads may be, there is nothing to show that they could not be equally well managed by public officers on behalf of the people, without the intervention of the capitalists at all. In the second place, it is suggested that, even for the best and most important services, it is possible to pay too much, and that such is already the position of the people in their relations to the owners of the railroads. It is broadly stated that the monopoly of the transportation of the country implies the establishment of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an oligarchy of wealth, and arms that oligarchy with the means of subverting the liberties and undermining the prosperity of the great majority of the people.

Space would not permit the examination of both these lines of argument here, but something may be done to elucidate the first. To do this, it is, fortunately, not necessary to enter upon seriously questionable matters of fact. For the purposes of the argument, most of what is alleged on behalf of the existing system of private ownership of railroads may be admitted. It may be granted that the results of private enterprise in America have been to supply the people with railroads at least as well equipped and managed as those of Europe, and to an extent which, in proportion to population, throws European countries into the shade. It may be freely admitted that this is the more remarkable because in this country the population is a widely scattered one, compared with that of any European country, so much so that private enterprise has provided as much railroad accommodation for every three hundred and ninety people as private enterprise and Government interference combined have provided for every two thousand people in European countries. The question really at issue is not whether these things are so, but whether all the good things which private capital claims to have done for America, in providing transportation, could not have been as well or better done by the people through their Government for themselves.

Experience alone can satisfactorily answer such a question. Mere opinion is of no value in such a case, because even honest opinions will differ; but if it can be shown that the experiment has been made and is even now in full operation, the answer need no longer be one of opinion. To be thoroughly available, such an experiment must have been made in a country somewhat resembling this country in its conditions. It must have included both the construction and the operation of railroads by the Government on a large scale, and the Government must not be a despotic but a popular one, as nearly resembling that of America as possible. Fortunately, there is one country which lends itself in nearly every respect to such a comparison.

It may fairly be said that the island continent of Australia presents every one of the features necessary for such a comparison as has been suggested. If America is a new country, over

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much of which the population is widely scattered, Australia is even more new, and its population is still more thinly scattered. Its people are of the same race, and the methods of its Government are in all essential respects similar to those of this country. The people of Australia have adopted the policy of public ownership and public operation of the country's provision for railway transportation; they have constructed their own railroads with public money, and they operate their railroads by means of public servants; they have, moreover, done this in no niggardly way, but have supplied to themselves even a larger amount of railroad accommodation than private enterprise has given to the people of America. To these things may be added the fact that the system gives entire satisfaction to the people of Australia, who would, under no circumstances, consent to the abandonment of the policy which has now been in operation for thirty-five years.

The statements that follow are in no case matters of opinion or conjecture, but they rest on public accounts and official documents, open to all. For purposes of convenience, the five colonies of Australia are treated as one, there being no considerable difference in the policy pursued, and but little in the results obtained.

The settled districts of Australia do not as yet extend across the continent, but are confined to a strip of country following the eastern, southern and southwestern coasts for a distance of fully four thousand miles, and extending toward the interior for a distance of from three to five hundred miles. The country has few navigable rivers, and the problem of interior transportation in Australia has consequently been very similar to that which has confronted the people of America. Forty years ago, internal communication in all parts of Australia was carried on by means of stage coaches for travellers, and by bullock wagons for merchandise; and it was no unusual experience for the wagons bringing wool to a port to consume a month or six weeks in the journey, and as much more on the return trip. In each of the colonies the earliest attempts to supply better means of transportation were begun by private enterprise, and it was not until the inadequacy of that provision made itself apparent to the people and the people's Government that the system of State ownership was resorted to. From the date of the inauguration of the new policy of State railroads to the present

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time, each of the five colonies has steadily proceeded with the construction, year by year, of new lines; until it may be said, with literal truth, that no item of the public expenditure of any one of these colonies can be looked for with more certainty in the year's Parliamentary appropriation than that for the extension of the railroads of the colony. It may be said, indeed, that the Parliaments of Australia have systematically recognized the fact that in making railroads they were but carrying out the time-honored policy of every civilized Government the world has ever seen, by providing highways for the people.

The claim has been made in America that the people of this country owe it to the policy which has left the supply of modern transportation to private enterprise that they have obtained a supply of such conveniences, alleged to be far in excess of that supplied to any other nation. The claim is a mistaken one. Whatever might have been the result of entrusting to the enterprise and public spirit of the people of America and their representatives and Government the supply of transportation suited to their needs, it is beyond question that the experiment has been successfully made in Australia. The American capitalist points triumphantly to the fact that where European Governments have undertaken to supply their people with railroads they have only constructed one mile for about nineteen hundred people, while the capitalists of America have supplied a mile for every three hundred and ninety people in the country; and this they have pointed to as the essential difference between private enterprise and a cautious national policy of construction. The experience of Australia would seem to show that it is not the distinction between policies, but between different races and varying conditions, which accounts for America's supremacy over European countries in this respect. The young communities of Australia have been far more liberal in their supply of railroads to their own people, through the agency of their Governments, than even enterprising capitalists have been to the American people. There are to-day, as nearly as possible, three million eight hundred thousand people in Australia, and they have constructed, and are now operating for themselves successfully, as nearly as possible, twelve thousand nine hundred miles of public railroad—that is to say, one mile of road for rather less than three hundred people, or nearly one-fourth more accommodation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than that which has been supplied at so great a cost to the people of America. In the mere quantity, therefore, of the accommodation supplied to the people it is manifest that private enterprise can claim no superiority over a policy of national ownership.

But the question next arises as to the cost. It is conceivable that there may be communities so reckless of financial consequences that they would urge on railroad construction at a ruinous expense, merely because it would supply public work and public spoils; and such a policy could not be held up as an argument favorable to national ownership of railroads. What, then, has been Australia's experience of the cost of railroad construction; and how does it compare with America's experience? The Australian lines have been made at an average cost of $48,930 per mile. There, as here, all the lines have not been made on the same scale, nor have they all been equally costly, but it may be said with confidence that, with the exception of four or five of the greatest lines in this country, none others exceed the national railroads of Australia, either in construction or in equipment, while not a few compare very unfavorably with them in both respects. The cost of constructing and equipping the railroads of this country has amounted—if the returns made by the companies themselves are to be relied upon—to an average of upward of $56,000 per mile, or about $7,000 more than the people's lines in Australia. It is evident, therefore, that it is no necessary incident of Government railway construction that the people should be plundered in the process. The testimony of experts, and the yet more convincing evidence of the traffic carried and the cost of maintenance, make it clear that the people of Australia have succeeded in obtaining quite as good value for their money as the railway kings of America have been able to get for theirs.

This, however, is by no means all that has been gained by the people of Australia and denied to those of America. Not only have their railroads been supplied to them at a less cost per mile; not only have more miles been supplied in proportion to the numbers of the settlers; the money which went in building and equipping the lines cost a good deal less than that which was spent on the American lines. At first sight this may appear remarkable, but it is, after all, one of the elements in the whole question which cannot be overlooked. The credit of a whole people is always better than that of any part of it, however

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wealthy that part may be; and hence a whole community can borrow money more cheaply than any railroad company whatever within that community. The Governments of Australia are young, and the people are not yet numerous, compared with other nations, while they are few indeed compared with the millions of America; yet they are able, with ease, to borrow such money as they need for public works at an average rate of three and a quarter per cent. to-day. When the policy of constructing railroads at the public cost was inaugurated money was more costly; but the average interest now payable on the whole of the railway loans, amounting to upward of $600,000,000, for the whole of the colonies, is barely three and three-quarters per cent. It is only necessary to point out that the average interest on the bonded debts of the American lines is five per cent., and that, in addition to this, dividends are earned and paid upon a merely nominal paid-up capital, amounting to nearly two per cent. more, to make it evident that the people of Australia have obtained their railroads at hardly more than half the annual charge for interest which falls on the American people.

This, it must also be remembered, is by no means all that the people of America pay for their railroads. To induce the capitalists to speculate in building railroads in that part of the country which most nearly corresponds to all the settled districts of Australia—that is to say, the districts west of the Mississippi—the people of America have presented them with public lands nearly one-fourth part greater in area than the whole of the British Islands. When the Australian people had borrowed the money with which to construct and equip their railways, they knew exactly what they had cost them, and what they must pay in interest year by year for the advantage: nobody knows—nobody can even guess—what the people of America have paid, when they bestowed nearly ninety millions of acres of land—much of it the pick of the country—on the capitalists, on whom they conferred, at the same time, the privilege of charging the people practically what they chose for the privilege of transportation over the lines.

So far, therefore, as the original cost of constructing railroads is concerned, the experience of Australia is conclusive: it costs very much less for the people, through their Governments, to build their own railways than it does to have them built for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them by capitalists. The original expense is less rather than greater, and the cost of the money with which the work is done would appear to be about one-half as great. And, in addition to these advantages, the people need give no bonuses in the shape of lands, which put the practical control of the country into the hands of a small class of its people, and which may endow them with vast mineral wealth, leading to permanent social inequalities, and containing the germs of all that is worst in the class distinctions of older and less popularly governed countries.

But supposing this to be true, it may still be asserted that the railroads, once in operation, must be less economically and efficiently operated for a Government than they are by the servants of the capitalists. It may be reluctantly conceded that Governments, if they were honestly conducted, might succeed in building and equipping railroads as well and as cheaply under contract as private capitalists could do, and, in the face of the universal experience of Australia, this can hardly be denied; but it is the custom to treat as almost inconceivable the suggestion that, when constructed, they could be as well or as cheaply operated. Once more, the experience of Australia gives a conclusive answer to the question. Taking the returns of traffic on all the American lines in 1897, and of all the Australian lines in the same year, it would appear that the Government railroads in Australia were operated more economically than those of America. In this country the working expenses of the lines absorbed rather more than seventy per cent. of the earnings, leaving rather less than thirty per cent. of earnings to pay interest and dividends on loans and capital; in Australia the working expenses, in the same year, consumed rather more than fifty-eight per cent. of the earnings, leaving nearly forty-two-per cent. to meet the claims of interest—there being, of course, no dividends payable. It is to be noted that in every one of the Australian colonies the rates of wages for railroad workers of all grades, except the highest, are distinctly higher than for the same classes of workers in America; and also that the average rates for both goods and passengers are certainly not five per cent. higher than they are upon the lines of this country. That they are higher at all is caused by the fact that the policy adopted favors keeping the charges as low in the newest and most scantily settled districts reached by the lines as in the older and more densely peopled districts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The people's railroads in Australia do not yield any direct profit to the treasuries of the colonies, nor was it ever intended that they should do so. There is no reason, indeed, why the people's roads—with rails or without them—should be looked on as a source of revenue, any more than the postal service of the country. All that has been aimed at is to conduct them on such business principles as will prevent them from becoming a burden on the revenue. When they have paid working expenses; when they have borne the cost of all renewals of road or equipment; when, finally, they have paid the actual interest upon loans expended in their construction, they have earned all which it is desirable they should earn. The purpose of the State-owned railroads in Australia is the benefit of the settlers, and that alone; and in most of the colonies the traffic rates are kept below the level which yields enough to pay the actual charge for interest, on the ground that policy demands and justifies such rates inasmuch as they open the country to more extensive settlement, and the deficit will be repaid to the Treasury in land rents, and in the prices paid for the freehold of lands, which, in Australia at least, have not been given away to the capitalists. Such deficiencies in railway earnings are made a charge against the general revenue, and the average of such deficiency is from a quarter to a half per cent. on the railway loans. For purposes of comparison I append the official returns, showing some of the results of the system in force in the two countries in tabular form:

Country.	Capital cost.			Working expenses in proportion to gross revenue, 1897.	Per train mile run.		
	Total cost in millions of dollars.	Cost per mile.	Revenue return per cent.		Gross revenue.	Working expenses.	Net revenue.
America under private ownership.....	9,977	$56,715	4.01	70.4	$1.36	$0.96	$0.40
Australia under State ownership.....	628	48,930	2.98	58.7	1.47	.87	.60

There still remains the alleged danger that in a country governed popularly by the votes of the people great political evils must of necessity follow upon the adoption of any system of State railroads. It may be admitted at once that very much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

depends upon the people themselves. If the people adopt the degrading and pernicious doctrine that the community at large is a proper and natural subject for plunder at the hands of politicians, and of the tools and supporters of politicians, then it may be true that State railroads—or, for that matter, State armies and navies—will become hot-beds of corruption and menaces to the well-being of the country. On the other hand, the experience of Australia shows conclusively that it need not be the case if the people and their representatives have less unworthy ideas of government and a more honest code of conduct.

There has never been even a suspicion of undue influence brought to bear, by parties or by Governments, on the officials of the colonial railroads; it has never been even alleged that the service was used as a means of adding strength to an administration, or that its offices were filled with partisans. The system pursued in all the colonies practically prevents such a thing, and must do so, unless undermined by an organized system of corruption. That system consists in vesting in a small board of expert commissioners, appointed by the Government with the consent of Parliament, the absolute management and control of the lines and department, subject only to the railway act passed by each colony, and the schedules of regulations appended to it. Under the system the Commissioners can be removed during the term of years for which they are appointed—generally from seven to ten years—only for misconduct, in the same way in which a judge of the Supreme Court can there be removed. And the system extends throughout the service. The Commissioners make all appointments, but the official once appointed can only be removed for cause, and can demand a trial before a commission of inquiry when suspended for alleged cause. The result has been efficient service by good men who respect the public—whose complaints must be attended to if made against any official—and who likewise respect themselves, as the holders of positions of which they cannot be arbitrarily deprived.

Such, very briefly, has been the experience of Australia; and under it her people have been placed in the position of obtaining conveniences of transportation exceeding, in proportion to their numbers, those supplied to any other people whatsoever, at a cost which is less, by far, directly and indirectly, than is paid by any other community. It may be supposed by some persons that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even this experience can have no practical bearing on conditions existing in America, where a different system is already so strongly entrenched; and upon so large a question it would manifestly be impossible to enter here. On the other hand, it is to be remembered that, great as the railroad system of America now is, it is but small when compared with the provision that must be made for the increasing population of the future. It may even be true that, compared with that future, when every road will be provided with rails and some kind of motive power, the system is but in its infancy to-day. What, then, it may be asked, of that future? Are the capitalists of America to absorb the whole of the avenues of locomotion, and to own as one vast franchise all the means of the country's transportation? The experience of Australia has made it clear that that plan is not a cheap one for the vast majority of the people, as compared with national ownership; but the experience of Australia, or of any other country, fails even to suggest the results that may be expected to flow from handing a people over, bound hand and foot, to the tender mercies of the owners of large amounts of realized wealth. If any country can present an object lesson of that kind to-day, it is America; and it should need but a little investigation of the results to make thinking men consider the merits of any alternative system.

HUGH H. LUSK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAS CONGRESS ABDICATED?

BY JOSEPH PULITZER.

I.

On April 18, 1898, Congress, by a vote of 42 to 35 in the Senate and of 311 to 6 in the House, declared:

"That the people of the island of Cuba are and of right ought to be free and independent."

And it affirmed:

"That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination when that is completed to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

The evacuation of Cuba by the Spaniards was finished nearly a year ago. The "pacification" of the island is complete. Yet what has been done to carry out the solemn pledge of Congress to "leave the government and control of the island to its people?" Who expects ever to see a free and independent Cuba, or doubts the determination of Mr. McKinley that Cuba, like the Philippines, shall forever remain American territory?

On the 14th of February, 1899, Senator Bacon offered a joint resolution declaring the intention of Congress in ratifying the Spanish treaty. It affirmed:

"1. That the Government and people of the United States have not waged the recent war with Spain for conquest and the acquisition of foreign territory. . . .

"2. That in demanding and receiving the concession of the Philippine Islands it is not the purpose of the Government of the United States to secure and maintain dominion over the same as a part of the territory of the United States, or to incorporate the inhabitants thereof as citizens of the United States, or to hold said inhabitants as vassals or subjects of this Government.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"3. That . . . in recognition and in obedience to the vital principle announced in the great Declaration that governments receive their just powers from the consent of the governed, the Government of the United States recognizes that the people of the Philippines are and of right ought to be free and independent. . . .

"4. That the United States hereby disclaim any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or control over said islands, and assert their determination, when an independent government shall have been duly erected thereon entitled to recognition as such, to transfer to said government, upon terms which shall be reasonable and just, all rights secured under the cession by Spain, and to thereupon leave the government and control of the islands to their people."

This resolution received a tie vote of 29 to 29, and was rejected only by the casting vote of the Vice-President.

The Senate afterward adopted the McEnery resolution, in redemption of a pledge made by the Republican leaders to secure the ratification of the treaty, and without which pledge it could not have been ratified. This resolution declared:

"That by the ratification of the pending treaty of peace with Spain it is *not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of said islands into citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands* as an integral part of the territory of the United States. But it is the intention of the United States to establish on said islands a government suitable to the wants and conditions of the inhabitants of said islands, to prepare them for local self-government, and in due time to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interests of the citizens of the United States and the inhabitants of said islands."

What effect has this purpose of Congress, explicitly declared even in the weaker resolution adopted, had upon the policy of the President? Is it not a serious matter when a deliberate declaration of Congress is not regarded seriously by anybody—by the Executive least of all?

If the will of Congress is treated with universal indifference or contempt, what becomes of that respect for law which is essential in popular government?

II.

In that wise system of checks and balances embodied in the Constitution of the United States—an instrument which, although regarded in some quarters as antiquated, if not obsolete, is still the chart of our liberties, the foundation and framework of our Government—the vital powers of the Government were committed to Congress.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congress was to levy and collect taxes, to borrow money on the credit of the United States, to coin money and regulate the value thereof, *to declare war,* raise and support armies, provide and maintain a navy, to admit new States to the Union and to *"dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States."*

These are sovereign powers, essential to the very existence of the Government. Without them the Union could not endure.

In the distribution of powers and functions by the Constitution the President was made the Chief Executive. He was to execute the will of the people as declared through their representatives in Congress. He was authorized to make treaties and appointments to office only "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Every article of the Constitution contains proof of the purpose of its framers strictly to limit the authority and influence of the President. They designed to found a real government of, by and for the people, and to get as far as possible from the one-man power—the imperialistic idea—against which they had successfully rebelled.

A wide departure from these principles and from the early practice of our Government has gradually been made, but it was never so complete nor so startling as under the present Administration.

We are at war in the Philippines. Our troops engaged there are or soon will be 70,000 strong—an army larger than this nation has ever before actively employed against a foreign foe. They are supported by a fleet of forty-five war vessels. Yet war against the Philippines was never declared nor directly sanctioned by Congress. Congress may have had this contingency in mind when it authorized the increase of the army, but there is absolutely not one word of law nor a line of resolution to show that this increase was not voted as a precaution against possible European complications. In a matter so momentous as war the Constitution is to be strictly interpreted. War is too weighty an affair to hang upon an inference.

There is not a constitutional monarchy in Europe in which the sovereign would dare venture upon such a war as President McKinley has undertaken, without the express consent and sanction of the parliamentary body.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Philippine conquest is in truth and in fact Mr. McKinley's personal war, just as the Empress Eugénie, who forced the conflict with Germany in 1870, was credited with the saying, "This is my war." To affirm that such a tremendous military and naval movement is merely a President's posse for the "suppression of an insurrection" is to insult the intelligence of the people.

In addition to this the President, through one of his generals, has made a treaty or compact with the Sultan of Sulu, by which the United States have agreed to continue this potentate as the satrap of his dominions, to permit the existence of slavery and polygamy as "recognized institutions" of the islands, a "part of their religion," and to pay him and his chiefs and aids a monthly stipend of $510 for recognizing in turn our "sovereignty" in the Sulu ports. Could the Emperor William—could the Czar of Russia—perform an act of more absolute imperialism than this in settling the status of remote savage islands over which they might claim to have acquired jurisdiction?

But this is not all. We are exercising a protectorate over Cuba. We have secured Porto Rico by cession from Spain and are governing the island by military power. We have occupied the Island of Guam. We have annexed Hawaii.

And yet Congress adjourned in March without adopting any measure or giving any direction whatever for the government or control of one of these islands. It left them and the Philippines much more completely under the control of the President than ever the conquered provinces of Rome were under the rule of Cæsar. And Congress did this at the express wish of the President, conveyed through his mouthpiece in the Senate, that he be given a "free hand" in his "colonial" policy.

Was not this an abdication of the constitutional power of Congress over "the territories and other property of the United States?" Was it not an unprecedented departure from the principles and traditions of the Republic? By giving the President a "free hand" for nine months in a war of conquest in the Philippines, and in military administration in our other possessions that we really possess, has not Congress rendered possible—nay, invited—results that are likely to prove irrevocable, and yet that were never approved by the people or their representatives, and that are as repugnant to the best moral sense of the nation as they are certain to be detrimental to its highest welfare?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In failing to exercise its prerogative betimes, Congress has enabled the President and his associates to commit the Government to a policy which the Senate expressly disavowed in the McEnery resolution, and from which there is reason to believe the House would have emphatically dissented had a free expression of its views been permitted.

This enormous "expansion" of the Executive power—this usurpation of the authority of Congress, to give the action its right name—has been promoted by two potent influences, not foreseen, or at least not provided against, by the framers of the Constitution.

III.

The first is party spirit. The President has become the head of a party. He is a party chief as well as the Chief Executive of the Government. No prerogative conferred upon him by the Constitution is so potent as this. It arrays behind him, if he be a shrewd politician—as Mr. McKinley is—the forces of party organization, party discipline, party loyalty and party rewards. We saw in the recent elections how "loyalty to the flag" was made synonymous with loyalty to the President. No man in Congress, no ambitious politician anywhere, can oppose the President's policy without "going against his party." And to go against the party, whenever the President chooses to enter upon a war of "criminal aggression," is, in the view of the party organs and orators, to commit treason.

What all this means in ostracism and abuse the very few Republican Senators and Representatives who have had the courage to oppose the President's progressive militarism have learned to their cost. The force of party spirit, when invoked in support of the President, is seen in the failure of even so strong and courageous a leader as Thomas B. Reed to avow his convictions in an attempt to stem the tide of imperialism. By far the ablest and most courageous Republican in the House, a man of far more intellectual force than the President, with the enormous power of the Speaker in his hands, resigned his seat and quit public life largely because he could neither support nor successfully stand against the policy to which the President had, through the supineness of Congress, unalterably committed the party.

To continue and enforce the illustration: Mr. Reed's succes-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sor, Speaker Henderson, who has delivered one of the most graphic and powerful philippics against war ever uttered, and who was originally opposed to the forcible annexation of the Philippines, has been constrained by his ambition and by the forces dominating his party through the Administration to smother his convictions and to give his support to a war of "criminal aggression."

IV.

The other and allied force which has gradually made the President the master of Congress is the power of patronage. This was unknown to the earlier Presidents, or at least was not employed by them. Such an attempt as Mr. McKinley has successfully made to sap the independence and to influence the course of Senators and Representatives by honorary appointments and profitable patronage would have been vigorously resented in the earlier Congresses and have aroused the indignation of the people.

Examples of this misuse of the Executive power were Mr. McKinley's appointment of members of Congress on the Hawaiian Commission; his selection of two Senators, both members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as commissioners to make a treaty with Spain, upon which they were to sit in judgment in the Senate; his tender of the English Ambassadorship to Senator Hoar, in the hope of silencing that conscientious statesman's opposition to the Philippine scheme; the commissioning of Representatives as Generals in the Army, in direct contravention of the Constitution, and the bestowal of offices and patronage upon Democratic Senators in return for votes for the Spanish treaty. Another and even more scandalous case was the desertion of his party to vote for the treaty by a Democratic Senator then under indictment in a Federal court for a criminal offense, and the quashing of the indictment against him by a Republican appointee of the President, within a short time after the ratification of the treaty *by a single vote.*

Still another illustration of this power of the President is found in the action of Mr. McKinley's Philippine Commission. At the head of this body, sent to the islands to inquire into the conditions there prevailing, was Jacob Gould Schurman, President of Cornell University—an institution founded in the true spirit of democracy, and dedicated to the education of young men in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

atmosphere and principles of genuine republicanism. When asked by the *World* on August 31, 1898, for his opinion as to "What shall we do with the Philippines?" President Schurman replied:

> "*This Republic, whose soul is self-government, does not want Asiatic dependencies or the military despotism they would entail.* **The proximity of Cuba made its misgovernment our affair.** *But we are not called upon to rectify the tyrannies of Africa or Asia.* **Nor are we under any obligation to Aguinaldo and the insurgents.** *Let us keep to our own hemisphere, seeking only naval stations in the Old World.*"

In the face of these wise and unanswerable truths, so tersely stated, Mr. Schurman, after a brief enjoyment of Executive honor and favor, joins in a report to the President not merely favoring this "Asiatic dependency," with the "military despotism" which it has entailed, but proposing to undertake the impossible, the grotesque task of making their millions of semi-civilized or wholly savage inhabitants "more American than the Americans themselves."

The opportunists in politics are now joining the partisans of the President in saying that the whole question of the disposition and government of the Philippines will be "in the hands of Congress" when resistance to our "sovereignty" shall be suppressed. What a mockery of words! With the islands and their inhabitants purchased from Spain, according to Judge Day, and then subjugated by order of Mr. McKinley, what alternative is left to Congress? Will a Republican Congress nullify the President's war by giving to the Filipinos the freedom for which they have been fighting? Could there be a more ridiculous and stultifying climax to his campaign of "benevolent assimilation," so costly in blood and treasure, than a notification to the surviving natives that Congress had decided not to assimilate them?

No! Congress, it is perfectly well known, will do whatever party policy requires, and the party policy has been irrevocably determined by the President. There may be a few voices raised in protest, the feeble sign of a surviving "remnant of conscience" in the great party whose first platform had for its corner-stone the Declaration of Independence; but the majority are bound hand and foot and committed in advance to the President's European policy. They will take their cue from his message—their lines from the White House. Already, on the eve of the assembling of Congress, it is announced by the leaders of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

majority in both houses that there will be "no legislation for the Philippines or for Cuba." It is more than doubtful if even Hawaii or Porto Rico will be released from the control of the President's "free hand"—which is in the very nature of the case the military hand.

V.

It may be said that this is simply criticism, and that no remedy is suggested for the evils pointed out. "In a Republic every needed reform is possible," but the first condition of any reform is that the people shall be made aware of its necessity. Two practical remedies, however, almost suggest themselves:

1. *A Constitutional amendment extending the President's term to six years and making him ineligible to re-election.*

If this were done we should no longer see the President beginning on the very first day of his term to plan and work for a second term. We should not see our Presidents indulging in the menace of a foreign war to make capital for re-election, as President Harrison did in the Chili affair and President Cleveland did in the Venezuelan incident, or actually leading the country into a war of conquest and "empire," as Mr. McKinley has done in the Philippines. A single term for the Executive, as was the original intention of the Constitutional Convention, would limit the ambition of the President and remove the temptation, which is now apparently irresistible, to use his power for personal and partisan ends.

2. *The withdrawal from the hands of the President, by a radical and permanent system of civil-service reform, of the enormous patronage involved in the distribution of more than* 100,000 *offices.*

It is by the use and the temptation of this patronage that the President makes himself the dictator of his party and secures the support not only of Senators and Representatives, but of the bosses who control State organizations and hold Presidential delegations in the hollow of their hands. The power of patronage personally wielded by the President is greater than that exercised by any sovereign of Europe. It is an anachronism in modern government, an absurd anomaly in a Republic. Our entire subordinate and routine civil service should be taken out of partisan politics and established permanently upon a basis of merit and fitness. That this would tend greatly to keep the President within

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his constitutional limitations and to restore the independence of Congress no student of history can doubt.

When the people's representatives prefer patronage to power and party servitude to conscience—when they obey their party boss instead of asserting their own authority—Congress has failed as a check upon the Executive and is no longer the guardian of popular liberty. The genius of republican institutions requires that Congress shall direct, guide, control the Executive. But to-day the President directs, guides, controls Congress.

JOSEPH PULITZER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONGRESS, THE PRESIDENT AND THE PHILIPPINES.

BY PERRY BELMONT.

THE country has expressed, with more or less distinctness and unanimity, a desire that Congress, when it assembles this month, shall legislate in regard to the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the islands recently ceded to the United States; taxation reform; currency and banking reform, and trusts.

There are reasons why the first-named of those subjects of legislation should have precedence, and the civil rights and political status of eight or ten millions of people be not postponed till after enactments relating to the other three topics.

The millions of native inhabitants of the ceded islands have now, under the Paris Treaty, no civil rights. The inhabitants who were born in Spain have political rights stipulated by the treaty, but the natives have none. The United States promised Spain that Congress would determine "the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants." That obligation is as yet unfulfilled.

It is unusual for human beings not to have any nationality. Spain was constrained to abandon those natives, and sunder their allegiance to her. The United States did not by the treaty make them citizens, nor naturalize them, nor give them an opportunity to become citizens. Probably the wisest lawyer cannot say whether the natives could leave the islands till Congress has given permission, although the right of expatriation, repatriation and naturalization is cherished in our country, nor whether the natives now owe such allegiance to our Government that they can be punished for treason if they levy war on the United States.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The precise condition, in our American law, of inhabitants of a country ceded to the United States is obscure till Congress has made a definition, if the treaty of cession does not prescribe it. The Supreme Court is reported as saying in Rapentigny's case, that "the conqueror, who has obtained *permanent* possession of the enemy's country, has the right to forbid the departure of his new subjects or citizens from it." If the native inhabitants of the Philippines could not depart therefrom without permission from Washingon, they would be like mediæval feudal serfs.

Up to the date of recent treaty, cessions of foreign territory to the United States determined the *status*, as to citizenship, of the inhabitants. The Spanish treaty, ceding Florida, admitted them, declared the Supreme Court, in Canter's case, "to the enjoyment of the privilege and immunities of the citizens of the United States." That was the invariable rule of our treaties of cession up to 1898.

It was expedient to make a new departure in the recent treaty, the two chief points of contention disclosed in the protocols being the Cuban debt and the cession of the Philippines. Denying that, under the August protocol, the American plenipotentiaries were entitled to demand cession of sovereignty over the Philippines, Spain proposed to submit that question to arbitration, but the American plenipotentiaries rejected the proposal, and offered to Spain twenty millions for the Philippines, which offer Spain accepted. Thereupon the rights of the inhabitants to choose their citizenship was considered, and it was agreed that the natives of Spain be allowed a year in which to decide whether or not to remain Spanish subjects, or adopt the nationality of "the territory" in which they might reside, but to the natives of the islands that right was refused by the American plenipotentiaries. Their civil rights were, by the ninth article, put absolutely in the hands of Congress which, our plenipotentiaries declared, "will enact laws to govern the ceded territories." That pledge, as an inducement to the signatures of the treaty, should be promptly met by fulfilment. The treaty does not declare that the "United States" (as in the fourth section of the fourth article of the Constitution relating to a "guarantee of a republican form of government") or the President, but that *Congress* shall determine the rights of the natives.

Existing uncertainty regarding the citizenship of children of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

natives born in the islands since April 11, 1899, is another reason why Congress should now clear up the question as far as it can. The fourteenth article of the Constitution declares that "all persons born, or naturalized, in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside," and the fifteenth article adds "that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied, or abridged, . . . on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

If the Philippines were "in" the United States on April 11, 1899, and a child of a native was born "subject to the jurisdiction thereof," then such a child became a citizen despite any present or future enactment by Congress. Was and is the Philippine archipelago "in" the United States? The treaty is silent on that question. If the parents and the child, being in the Philippines, were not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, then to the jurisdiction of what country were they, and are they now, subject? If such a child came to reside in New York, would it be a citizen of New York? It has been recently decided by the Supreme Court that a child even of Chinese parents is, if born in one of our States, a citizen of that State, and of the United States. Residing in Manila, the child would not, of course, be a citizen of any State of the United States, but *under* the fourteenth article would the child not be a citizen of the United States, and would it not have a status defined by the Constitution? Congress should express its opinion.

There is a most cogent reason, growing out of the Federal revenue, why legislation by Congress regarding Porto Rico and the Philippines should have priority — the doubt whether or not importations from those islands into our home ports are dutiable, and whether or not Congress is constitutionally bound to levy and collect duties on foreign imports into those islands uniform with those levied and collected at our home ports on like articles. The Constitution is explicit that "all duties . . . shall be uniform *throughout the United States*." Will Congress declare that the word "throughout" and the restriction apply only to the ports of forty-five States now in the Union? The Supreme Court has twice decided that the words "throughout the United States" embrace all of what Chief Justice Marshall described as the "American empire" and all of our "country."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is another reason why the Philippine problem should have priority, which is that "involuntary servitude" exists there in the form of Mohammedan slavery, and debt slavery, presenting, on the one hand, the relation of the slave to his owner as property, and on the other hand, to the United States as a human being. The thirteenth article of the Constitution forbids slavery, or involuntary servitude, to exist "within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction," except as a punishment for crime for which the party shall have been duly convicted. Must such convictions be by a common law jury?

The pens of pessimists and cynics in our politics will be sharpened if the Republican party in the present Congress, born as that party was, less than fifty years ago, of hostility to slavery and polygamy in our territories, should now protect or even tolerate those "twin relics" in the Philippines.

Besides these questions, arising under the last clause of the ninth article of the recent treaty, there are innumerable others growing out of the first ten additions, or amendments, to the Constitution. The first amendment especially, which is addressed to Congress by name and forbids it to do certain things, seems in effect to forbid the United States to do anywhere within its jurisdiction or under its sovereignty the enumerated acts, or to permit, in time of peace, the tyranny known as martial law. Will any one after reading that first amendment of the Constitution contend that Congress can, no matter what is in a treaty of cession, establish in any colony, or dependency, systems of religious faith and worship, or prohibit the full exercise of any system, or abridge free speech or the right of petitioning Congress to redress grievances?

The war against Spain, and the treaty ending the war and securing peace with Spain, are not now in issue. Those great transactions have been closed. The treaty has been, since that date, a supreme law of the land. The Philippines and Porto Rico are possessions of the United States by as valid and secure a title as are now New Mexico and Alaska.

There have been two theories regarding the possession of sovereignty over an area conquered and actually occupied, either by a foreign enemy, or by internal rebels. After Dewey had conquered the Bay of Manila, was its sovereignty in the United States or in Spain up to April 11, 1899? One theory, and an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

old one, is that it was in the United States, but the more modern and probably the better one is that the United States had full rights of occupancy and government, but the sovereignty of Spain was intact till the conquest had been completed by treaty, although the United States had legal authority to do there whatever was necessary for the prosecution of war. The Filipino insurgents were rebels against Spain. They had, outside of Manila, subdued Spanish resistance, and occupied as against Spain all of Luzon, as the Schurman Commission has recently declared. Taxes were paid to the insurgents and they were the *de facto* rulers, precisely as before the protocol of August 12, 1898, Dewey ruled in the harbor, and afterward Merritt or Otis ruled in the city of Manila. The Paris treaty was negotiated on the theory that Spain held the sovereignty and ceded to the United States a valid title to sovereignty over the entire archipelago. The fact that Luzon was, outside of Manila, held by the insurgents as conquered and occupied, and the United States had not at that time sovereignty over even the city, bay and harbor of Manila,should, it may be said, have constrained the President to be passive and unaggressive under the August protocol till the treaty had been ratified, and the ratifications exchanged.

That much-debated second clause of the third section of the fourth article of the Constitution, relating to the government of territories by Congress, requires a "belonging" to the United States. If Congress has the right to govern colonies and dependencies, not from the clause just referred to, but from the right to acquire them, or from the former and latter combined, then obviously acquiring and possessing the sovereignty are a condition precedent to governing.

It is easy and safe to say now that, since April 11, 1899, further enlargement of territorial area has not been a feasible and winning issue, in a political and partisan sense, but the immediate application by Congress of the Federal Constitution to such recent enlargements still holds the field as the pre-eminent duty of the legislative power.

Shall it be said that the present Government of the United States, created by the Constitution, can disregard the Constitution on land or sea over which our flag floats as an emblem of sovereignty, and require or authorize acts to be done which the Constitution has forbidden? Shall Congress destroy those limit-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ations on its own powers over States, territories and dependencies? Can the Government wander into the Orient so far that the Constitution is inoperative?

In an interview published last June, I said: "If such a severe test should be made as a choice between the Constitution or the Philippines, Democrats would, in my opinion, let the Philippines go. But no such test is likely or necessary. The President should satisfactorily punish Aguinaldo and his followers for their assault, early last February, on our army at Manila. When that has been accomplished, and Congress has assembled, there will be real problems that will press for solution."

An enlargement of the area of the United States is not to be decried, if an expansion of their political institutions, as prescribed by the Federal Constitution, shall accompany the territorial enlargement. Democrats do not condemn the successive enlargements which their party made under treaties with France in 1803, with Spain in 1819, and with Mexico in 1843 and 1853, but which the Whig party condemned. In all of them the Constitution expanded over the acquisitions. No one now denies that the Constitution extends over New Mexico, but some deny that the Philippines are a *part* of the "United States," as the term is used in the Constitution. They declare that the Constitution will not extend over the Philippines till after Congress has placed it there, arguing that the treaty ceding the Philippines is so radically and intentionally unlike all former treaties of cession that no judicial decision regarding "territory" can be a precedent. In all former treaties they say it was stipulated that the people of the ceded possession could, if remaining therein, be citizens of the United States. They are heard insisting that the body politic, described as "the United States," embraces, in strict law, only "States;" that the Constitution restrains Congress only when legislating for "States" and their inhabitants, and that, therefore, the Philippines are a dependency outside the Union and the Constitution till Congress shall bring them in by appropriate legislation.

An argument diligently put about of late and denying that Congress will be restrained by the Constitution, in executing the last clause of the ninth article of the treaty with Spain, is something like this:

The Constitution has created two kinds of jurisdiction—one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for internal and one for external and imperial affairs. The former is now confined to the existing forty-five States, and is limited in scope, but the latter is unrestrained, excepting possibly by the law of nations. Under it the Government of the United States can lawfully do all that any nation can, unless the Government hamper itself by treaty or by a statute, accepting the Constitution as a restraint. In the latter sort of jurisdiction Congress has, it is said, whatever power may be needed. Therefore, as the treaty with Spain has not imposed any restraint on Congress the legislative power will be unimpeded in Porto Rico and the Philippines, and till Congress shall have legislated to the contrary, the President, will, under the law of nations, have a free hand in the islands. Will Congress abstain from enacting restraint?

Imperialism exultingly reminds us of the truth that a judicial precedent, although made by Marshall and Taney, cannot bind, under the recent treaty, excepting in a case the facts of which cannot be distinguished from those of the decided case, and that therefore there will be no binding precedents for the questions arising in governing Porto Rico and the Philippines. What then is to restrain the rude hand of power and party passion in President or Congress from enacting a *post facto* law, or making arrests by general warrant, or prosecuting a second time for the same offence, or making property of a human being, or taking private property for a public purpose without payment, or denying jury trials, or depriving persons of life, liberty or prosperity without due process of law, or confiscating property held by churches, Catholic or Protestant, by monasteries, convents, priests, monks or friars?

Empire, Emperor and Empress seem now to be captivating words all over the world. They are modern revivals of the old. It is less than a quarter of a century since, by act of Parliament under Lord Beaconsfield, the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland assumed the title of "Empress of India," the great dependency being as much outside of the United Kingdom and the British Constitution as the Philippines would be outside of the United States and the American Constitution—if those to whom I have referred carry out their intention. "Territories" are nothing new in our political system. The word is in our Constitution. There have been differences of opinion as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to whether or not the Constitution, *proprio vigore,* covers a foreign territory as soon as acquired, as well as over the question of the power which Congress can exercise in a territory. The last question precipitated the war of the Secession. Whether or not the amendments of the Constitution enforcing trial by jury must be applied in a territory has, since then, been repeatedly considered by the Supreme Court.

If the Philippines are not to be "a part" of the United States, nor to be under the Constitution, nor to have a civil government, is it material whether the titular designation of our Executive shall be "President of the United States of America, and Emperor of the Philippines?"

Debate in Congress ought not to be postponed, evaded, or avoided by pleading the existing war. There is no war in Porto Rico. The debate must come. It is due to the Porto Ricans that it come now and they know whether or not the American Constitution and the Supreme Court are to protect them. Is the Constitutional question of the power of Congress different in Porto Rico from what it is in New Mexico? Can Congress go outside the Constitution in the exercise of civil authority in Porto Rico?

The end and aim of war is peace, and the quickest route to peace with the Filipinos is for Congress to intervene, inquire into the facts, convince the natives of the good faith of the United States, and prescribe terms of pacification. When that has been done, the natives will know their fate. Whatever the reason for retaining the Philippines—whether as a trust only for the good of the native inhabitants, or as a military and naval station, or as a trading country under our flag, or a stepping-stone to Asia, or as an American commercial rival to British Hongkong and Singapore, or as a point of easy departure when China, the "sick man," is on a death bed—the first and indispensable thing is for our Congress to win and deserve the confidence and friendship of natives now alienated from us.

There are those who say that if the Government at Washington is to be restrained in dealing with the Philippines, by the taxing clauses of the Constitution, by the first ten amendments, and by the thirteenth and fourteenth as well, then it will be impracticable to rule all over the islands. A code of criminal law in the island of Sulu, for example, requiring conviction for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crime by a jury, an indictment, a judge and petit jury would, it is said with cogency, make world-wide merriment. It may, however, be that if Congress refuses to tolerate in our new islands the things which the Constitution declares shall not anywhere be done, self-government there will not be a failure.

Many experts assume that free trade between Porto Rico, the Philippines and all our ports, if the same rate of duties are levied in those islands as at our home ports on foreign imports, is impracticable. Therefore it is suggested, in order to avoid the danger, that if Congress shall execute at all the last clause of the ninth article of the treaty, or shall in any manner legislate for Porto Rico and the Philippines, the restraints of the Constitution will attach themselves to Congress and the Supreme Court will acquire jurisdiction, Congress abstain from any action, and thus the Constitution will be circumvented by permitting the present military power of the President to continue indefinitely. That device comes from those who fear the Constitution will expand over the new islands, and restrain Congress, whenever it shall legislate for the islands, and shall determine the status of the natives. It does not come from those who contend, as so many do with great subtlety, that with the single exception of prohibiting slavery, the Constitution was made only for the States in the Union, and does not expand over territories, or colonies, or dependencies, and that Congress is as free to do what it pleases in the Philippines as the British Parliament is to do as it pleases in India, or any crown colony.

As an indication of tendency of opinion regarding the scope of the President's war powers, and their continuing duration, the following publication, a few days ago, is significant: "Attorney-General Griggs after a careful consideration has decided that the President as Commander-in-Chief of the Army, and not as President, could make appointments of Civil Governors without legislation by Congress. He thus holds that the President exercises absolute control over territory held through military occupation, and that none of his acts regarding such territory can be called in question so long as they are not made in his purely civil capacity as President."

The vast powers of the President in a foreign country, as Commander of the Army and Navy, after Congress has declared war, or war exists, are not adequately realized by all of us. He

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is in theory under the restraint of the Constitution and Congress, but yet his power is in practice uncontrolled. We have seen that in Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines. The Constitution adopts the law of nations which prescribes the usages of war, which usages impart to the President that tremendous power so unlike that which he possesses in time of peace. When peace came, that despotic power fell.

The President claims it was revived by another war, undeclared by Congress, but created by the conduct of the Filipino insurgents on the fourth of February last. On April 11, 1899, the Spanish political system disappeared from the Philippines, and an American political system took its place, established by necessity and by its own force. What was that American system, thus applicable to the Philippines? The treaty defined it as to be the one to be prescribed by Congress. But Congress was not convened by the President. What then was his power in the newly acquired islands after April 11, 1899? It was settled in California a half century ago. It was debated in Congress and finally determined by the Supreme Court. At that time, there was in California, a young lieutenant of army engineers who was Secretary to the Military Governor, and subsequently, as General Halleck, produced out of that large practical experience a treatise on the American laws of conquest and cession, and on the President's power when Congress has not legislated, which treatise was referred to at Paris by both Governments as an authoritative text book. If there be a difference between the President's power in California and in the Philippines, after proclamation of the treaties of peace, it is to the diminution of McKinley's power in comparison with Polk's, because the recent Spanish treaty, unlike the Mexican treaty, distinctly excluded executive power by requiring Congress to prescribe a political and civil code.

It is argued with more or less plausibility, that Porto Rico and the Philippines have been since the middle of last April "a part" of the United States and under its sovereignty in foreign affairs and in an international sense, but not a part thereof, and under Constitutional jurisdiction, in domestic affairs, and in a national sense. Constitutional and legal truth respecting our new acquisitions cannot be long obscured. A case presenting the problem may find its way to the Supreme Court. An importer com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pelled to pay duties on an import from one of those islands may do so under an adequate protest presenting for interpretation the phrase, "throughout the United States," appeal from the Collector's decision to the Treasury and, if the Collector be sustained, begin a suit to recover back the money paid.

Whatever may be the final outcome of argument and debate of those Constitutional questions, Congress cannot well evade, quite apart from obligations imposed by the treaty, the task of prosecuting an inquiry in order to ascertain what have been, since May, 1898, the real relations of Aguinaldo to the President, as well as to the naval and military authorities. Such an impartial inquisition is needed in order to ascertain how peace in the Philippines can be most safely obtained and assured.

Aguinaldo may be in captivity or exile before this paper has been published, but the question why so many natives of Luzon have so long followed his standard of revolt from the benevolent assimilation promised in the President's December military order will remain to be explained by Congress.

It has been industriously put about that those who delayed ratification of the treaty from the fourth of January (as if that were an excessive period of time) till the sixth of February, are chiefly responsible for insurgent conduct on the fourth of the last named month, which created belligerence around Manila. The recent preliminary report by the Schurman Commission has put an end to that, by showing that a falling out between the natives and our troops began on Merritt's arrival; that then the Filipino newspapers started anti-American feeling, and the "popular clubs" were organized to assail us within and without Manila. The Commission affirmed that "the relations between the two forces were strained from the beginning;" that after the landing of our troops Aguinaldo decided to start the insurrection. The Commission has said he did not openly declare that he intended to attack our troops, but he aroused and excited his followers, and especially the military element, by claiming independence. The Commission was not distinct and explicit regarding the relative responsibility of Aguinaldo and the co-operative natives, but the following sentence in the report alluding to failure of negotiations by the Commission with Aguinaldo's representatives, inculpates the former as most to be blamed: "No better proof could be furnished that the primary object of his struggle is not, as is pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tended, the liberty of the Filipino peoples, but the continuance of his own arbitrary and despotic power."

It may be inferred that the negotiations referred to broke down because Aguinaldo asked for a "suspension of hostilities," which the Commission refused to discuss "as being a military matter," and because the Commission, not representing Congress, could not deal with the insurgents with sufficient authority. It issued a proclamation on the fourth of last March, declaring "the principles by which the United States would be guided in exercising the sovereignty which Spain had ceded to us over the Philippine islands, and assuring the people not only of their rights and privileges, but also of the largest participation in government which might be found compatible with the general welfare and reconcilable with the sovereign rights and obligations of the United States," and verbally assured Aguinaldo's agents "of a liberal form of government when they laid down their arms," but all the Commission offered, or could offer, was necessarily vague and unsatisfying, because the Commission did not represent Congress.

What Admiral Dewey, on arriving at New York, has been reported as saying to the Associated Press agent is more illuminating, in explanation of the failure of the President's Commission, than the official report he signed as Commissioner. This is it:

"Aguinaldo was a junior clerk in the navy-yard. He is a pretty smart fellow. I know him pretty well. In fact we were great friends, and are, for the matter of that, but he has not the brains. There are people behind him, some of them lawyers and able fellows, who make a tool of Aguinaldo. The fight in the Philippines should be easily ended. The people had been so badly treated for such a length of time by the Spaniards that they were distrustful. This is the great difficulty in dealing with them. Where we have met them and they have been in such contact with us so as to learn that we mean to treat them well; where they have seen that we mean what we say, there is no trouble. They stand by us all the time."

A Commission sent by Congress, instead of by the President, might have met a better fate.

When Congress seriously takes in hand the real relations at Manila since May, 1898, between the United States and the for-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mer rebels against Spain, it will naturally look to see what the President's plenipotentiaries said and did at Paris regarding Aguinaldo and the forces standing around him. The precise nature of the "political pledges," expressed or implied, that were given may not be accurately known by the public in our day, if ever. Each reader of narrations of the events from April 15 to August 15, 1898, will, nevertheless, draw his own inferences.

It is indisputable that the subjects of Spain led by Aguinaldo gave aid to Dewey and Merritt in accomplishing the capitulation of Manila. In the annex to the thirteenth protocol of the Paris treaty, the American plenipotentiaries are recorded as saying:

"The city was closely besieged on the land side by the insurgents. It was in extremities for provisions, and the insurgents controlled the water supply. The Spanish forces had been unable to raise the siege, and therefore could not escape from the city on the land side."

Again, in the first protocol, it is set forth that the Spanish plenipotentiaries, having alluded to the Tagalo rebels as forming, during the campaign, "an auxiliary force to the regular American troops," the American plenipotentiaries replied in the fifteenth protocol that alliance with the Filipinos "is not a relation which the Government of the United States intended to establish, but it must, at least, be admitted that the insurgent chiefs returned and resumed their activity with the consent of our military and naval commanders, who permitted them to arm with weapons which we had captured from the Spaniards, and *assured them of fair treatment and justice.*"

Those last seven words indicate that assurances of a definite nature were, by somebody, given to the insurgents, and yet President McKinley in his last annual message describing to Congress the surrender of Manila did not allude to them. It is open to him to argue that he never encouraged, authorized, or ratified the acts of our Consuls in bringing Admiral Dewey and Aguinaldo together, or sanctioned what Admiral Dewey did in placing Aguinaldo in a position to fight against Spain at the head of the insurgents. In August, 1898, he instructed Adjutant-General Corbin to cable General Merritt that there must not, by Aguinaldo's insurgents, be joint occupation with us of Manila, and that they must obey the proclamation of a truce under the protocol. Congress will explore and decide.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Consuls at Manila, Singapore and Hongkong wrote fully concerning Aguinaldo to the State Department, and on June 16, 1898, it replied by order of the President to Consul-General Pratt at Singapore, admonishing him to make no promises to Aguinaldo, or "any alliance with the Philippine insurgents," but "to obtain the *unconditional personal assistance* of General Aguinaldo in the expedition to Manila would be proper if, in so doing, he was not induced to form hopes which it might not be practicable to gratify."

Consul-General Pratt brought Admiral Dewey and Aguinaldo together and, under the eye of Dewey, Aguinaldo, before Manila capitulated, conquered, and held by conquest, a great part of Luzon as the Schurman Commission affirmed. Aguinaldo's "personal assistance" had been obtained, and accepted.

The Schurman Commission reported that "he (Aguinaldo) arrived with thirteen of his staff on May 19 and immediately came on board the "Olympia" to call on the Commander in-Chief, after which he was allowed to land at Cavité and organize an army. This was done with the purpose of strengthening the United States' forces and weakening those of the enemy. No alliance of any kind was entered into with Aguinaldo, nor was any promise of independence made to him, then or at any other time. Shortly afterward the Filipinos began to attack the Spanish. Their number was rapidly augmented by the militia, who had been given arms by Spain, all of whom revolted and joined the insurgents. Great Filipino successes followed. Many Spaniards were taken prisoners, and while the Spanish troops now remained quietly in Manila, the Filipino forces made *themselves* masters of the entire island, except that city." Mention of the furnishing of arms to Aguinaldo by Dewey was omitted in the report.

General Merritt testified at Paris:

"It was not the wish of the Government to make any promises to the insurgents, or act in any way with them. I had telegraphed to the War Department of the possible trouble that might arise with the insurgents, and asked for instructions as to whether I should consider them as enemies, and treat them accordingly in such case. *To that request I had no reply.*"

The injunction of secrecy was by the Senate removed from that testimony of January 11, 1899. Its publication was ordered. Anybody's imagination is equal to fancying its effect on the Fili-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pinos and Aguinaldo when read by them, as it should never have been.

It may not be necessary that a Committee of Congress visit the archipelago. There are witnesses, documents, records, letters and cable messsages in Washington. If the Executive will submit all of them to Congress, they may, when collected, be examined and analyzed, and a keen, free debate in both houses of Congress had thereover furnish all the light that is required in execution of the ninth article of the treaty.

The members of the Schurman Commission have been and are, collectively and individually, zealous in denial that hopes were officially held out to the insurgents between the middle of March and August, 1898, which the President has not fulfilled or recognized. It is plainly disclosed in Senate Document No. 62, pages 318 to 362, that Consuls Williams, Wildman and Pratt, and Admiral Dewey, had frequent conversations with Aguinaldo before the capitulation of Manila. All those officers are now accessible, and cross-examinations by a Committee of Congress ought to uncover the truth.

By the protocol signed at Washington on August 12, 1898, the United States were to hold the city, bay and harbor of Manila, and nothing else, "pending the conclusion of a treaty of peace," which treaty when signed stipulated that to be binding it must be ratified by our Senate and President, by the Queen of Spain, and the ratifications be exchanged at Washington within six months. Otherwise there was no treaty. The Philippine islands were not to be evacuated by Spain till after such exchange of ratifications, and, meanwhile, the protocol of August 12, 1898, was to remain in force. The treaty was not ratified by our Senate till February 6, 1899, nor by Spain till March 19, 1899, nor were ratifications exchanged till April 11, 1899. Till the last-named date, the United States had therefore no title to, or sovereignty over, the Philippines, and had not lawful power to hold and rule any part of the archipelago excepting the city, bay and harbor of Manila. Outside of that limit, Aguinaldo and his forces had, by public law, the right to rule wherever, and so far only as, their conquests and military occupation completely expelled Spanish power. Over that area, the people, styling themselves the "Philippine Republic," or by any other name, had as good a right in law to rule as the United States had to rule over Santiago imme-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diately after its conquest early in July. That was the situation on December 10, 1898, and up to April 11, 1899. The United States could not lawfully invade the area held by Aguinaldo till the treaty had been ratified because the protocol forbade.

In that situation of the facts and applicable law, the President, only eleven days after the signature of the treaty of Paris, and before it had been ratified even by himself, ordered the Secretary of War to proceed to "the actual occupation and administration of the entire group of the Philippine islands," and to the extension, with all possible dispatch, of "the military government, heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor and bay of Manila, . . . to the whole of the ceded territory." "Ceded" by what? Not by treaty, for it had not at that time been ratified by any body, and Congress had not even agreed to pay the twenty millions which was the condition precedent of cession. The two premises assigned by the President in the order as its reason and justification were, first, that by Dewey's victory and the capitulation of Manila, the "conquest" of the entire archipelago had been effected. The second premise was that, by the treaty of peace signed at Paris, "the future control, disposition and government of the Philippine islands are *ceded* to the United States," which was equivalent to saying that a treaty is binding when only signed by agents appointed by the President.

The illegality of the order was bad enough, but its stupidity as diplomacy in pacifying and conciliating the Filipinos was worse. It was a blow in the faces of those whom the United States wished to allure to consent to be led by Congress upward and onward in happiness and welfare. There was not in the order a persuading sentence! Each was alienating and repelling! With one hand the President offered the Filipinos submission to him and with the other he threatened war. The choice was offered to millions of people over whom the United States had not a scintilla of lawful authority, and could get none under the protocol till the treaty had been ratified. A month later the President appointed the Schurman Commission to facilitate "the effective extension of authority throughout these islands," and over a people at that time not under the sovereignty of the United States. The name of the official who wrote those two orders is as yet unknown by the public, but it ought to be, as an example and a warning, if the order sent toward the end of December explains the tension of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bitterness and emotion which brought on the existing belligerence between Otis and Aguinaldo.

In one aspect, that December order is now immaterial excepting as an Executive act not to be commended by Congress as a precedent, but it is of paramount importance if it provoked the deplorable incident at Manila of the fourth of February, and Congress should take cognizance of it as a piece of evidence tending to explain why the natives whom the United States rescued from Spain are now in arms against their deliverer and former ally.

After the disastrous effect of the December order had been felt in Washington, the need of more soldiers in Luzon had been seen and the country was beginning to condemn the President because there was not in Manila an army large enough to enforce his December order; the President offered his defence at Pittsburg. It tore in pieces his December order. It was this:

"Until the treaty was ratified (April 11, 1899), we had no authority beyond Manila city, bay and harbor."

"We then had no other title to defend, no authority beyond that to maintain."

"Spain was still in possession of the remainder of the archipelago."

The last sentence of the defence was inaccurate, because the insurgents were, as the Schurman Commission reported, in possession of a large part of Luzon. On what pretext could the President have signed that December order? It is the work of Congress to ascertain.

It is plain now to see that the Philippines are not to be surrendered, abandoned, and left derelict. For good or ill, they are in our hands. Armed rebellion will be suppressed, either by removal of misunderstandings, or, if that fails, then by the armed hand. If it shall be decided that the Constitution has already expanded over the archipelago and is not to be circumvented; that Congress is in its every act under the restraint of the Constitution, but that the Philippines cannot, under the Constitution, be reduced to order and elevated in civilization, then the Constitution will be an impediment in the "vast mission for the advancement of mankind," alluded to by Lord Salisbury, in association with the United States, and to which, perhaps, our country has been committed so far as the Executive can bind it. Then our country has really come to "the forking of the road."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The United States Government is not bound to "go into all the world" preaching any other political gospel than that of its written Constitution, under which every new acquisition has been treated as an inchoate State, to be trained and fitted for immortality as a member of our glorious Union of States. Only of that Constitution, that Union, that expansion, that country, has our flag hitherto been an emblem wherever it has floated on land or sea.

A specific obligation confronts the next Congress, imposed by the last clause of the ninth article of the recent treaty, and accepted by its ratification.

"The civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories thereby ceded," must be determined. Congress must in the determination decide first of all whether or not the treaty has removed, diminished or impaired any of the restraint, which, before the war with Spain, was imposed by the Constitution on Congress when legislating for the territory, or other property, of the United States. Next, whether or not that restraint is so expressly declared and asserted in the Constitution that the Supreme Court must adjudge null and void any legislation disregarding and repudiating that restraint. Finally, if the restraints upon Congress are not literal and explicit, in words to be applied to the Philippines, then, whether or not the principles of our constitutional liberties and of the fundamental limitations in favor of personal right and civil rights, formulated in the Constitution and its amendments, constrain Congress in executing the ninth article of the treaty.

PERRY BELMONT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SECURING THE GOLD STANDARD BY LAW.

BY JOHN DALZELL, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND OF THE REPUBLICAN CAUCUS COMMITTEE.

THE period preceding the last Presidential election was one of great business depression among the American people. It was also one of great anxiety. However men may differ as to the causes of the depression, there can be no question that the chief cause of anxiety arose from a fear that the American monetary standard, which was that of the leading civilized nations in modern times, might be abandoned for the silver standard. The advocates of the free coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one contended that the demonetization of silver and the scarcity of gold had caused a fall of prices and a paralysis of industry, and that prices could only be restored and prosperity regained by the opening of our mints to the free coinage of both gold and silver, and to the latter at the named ratio. They freely predicted that a failure to adopt their remedy would result in still further depression. This was one of the most important issues of the campaign upon which the advocates of the gold standard and their opponents went to battle. The Republican platform declared that "the existing gold standard must be preserved," and it went on to say:

> "All our paper currency must be maintained at parity with gold, and we favor all measures designed to maintain inviolable the obligations of the United States, and all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard, the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth."

The result of the contest was an emphatic endorsement of the Republican position, and a positive declaration in favor of the maintenance of the existing standard. Following upon the last election, there has come a revival of business activity and a period of prosperity unprecedented in our history. The prophecies of the free-silver advocates have failed of fulfilment, and their stock

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

argument of a relation between the price of silver and the price of wheat and other commodities has been shown to be wholly fallacious.

With the renewal of confidence in the integrity of our money, and as a result of the operations of the protective tariff promptly enacted upon Mr. McKinley's accession to office, capital has fearlessly sought investment, labor has found abundant employment, wages have been increased and an export trade has been established marvellous in its value and extent, so that now the United States has become a potent factor in the battle for commercial supremacy and a dangerous rival for the possession of the markets of the world.

Following upon Republican success, it was natural and just that the people should ask that the pledge of the Republican platform be given "the vitality of public law," as President McKinley suggested in his strong speech before the Manufacturers' Association in New York early in 1898. This popular wish, in addition to its general expression in the public prints, found particular expression in two Conventions, representing many of the Boards of Trade of the country, held in Indianapolis in January, 1897, and January, 1898, and by the separate action of many other commercial bodies. There were various reasons why the pledge of the party could not be redeemed during the life of the first Congress under President McKinley's administration. The most obvious reason was that the Senate was not safely under the control of a sound-money majority. There was such a majority in the House of Representatives, and its members listened with courtesy and consideration to Mr. H. H. Hanna, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Indianapolis Monetary Convention, and others, the delegated representatives of the business men's conventions.

When, at last, after the elections of 1898, it became obvious that the new Congress, to meet in December, 1899, would have a majority in both branches for the gold standard, after conference it was determined that a caucus of Republican members should be called to decide upon a plan for securing early action in the Fifty-sixth Congress. This caucus, held on February 2, 1899, voted, by seventy-eight to four, that a committee of eleven members of the House who had been elected members of the succeeding House should be designated by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Chairman of the caucus to prepare a measure for submission to a future caucus at the first session of the new Congress. This course was taken in order that there might be no delays after the meeting of Congress in regular session in December, and that the approach of the Presidential election might not interpose embarrassments to prompt and effective action. The Republican party, through its representatives in the House, thus by an overwhelming majority expressed its willingness to redeem its pledge to give to the gold standard the sanctity of public law, at the earliest possible moment after the power to do so was acquired. The Republican members of the Senate Committee on Finance took similar action, and both the committees named met during the spring or summer (though not together), and spent many days in serious study of the best means to carry out the policy of the party and the wishes of the people.

The House Committee was made up of General Grosvenor, the Chairman of the caucus; of David B. Henderson, of Iowa, now destined to be the Speaker of the next House; Sereno E. Payne, of New York, then Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means; John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania; William C. Lovering, of Massachusetts; Jesse Overstreet, of Indiana; Joseph W. Babcock, of Wisconsin; Winfield S. Kerr, of Ohio; Charles Curtis, of Kansas; R. B. Hawley, of Texas; Page Morris, of Minnesota, and Eugene F. Loud, of California.

Inasmuch as the question at issue had been carefully considered and reported upon by two committees of the Fifty-fifth Congress, it was deemed wise that the caucus committee should be composed of members who had not theretofore had the subject in charge, so that when the caucus should meet it might have the results of the investigation and thought of as many of its members as possible.

This caucus committee met at Atlantic City on April 17, 1899, and sat almost continuously for more than two weeks, considering the provisions of a financial measure. The result of their deliberations was the adoption of a bill which has not been made public, but which will be laid before the Republican caucus at the coming meeting of Congress.

The first essential feature of any effective legislation dealing with the standard is that it shall be fixed by law. The gold standard has become the standard of civilized nations by a process

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of evolution, which has led to a natural preference for the least variable, most compact, most easily transportable, and therefore most economical metal in the great transactions of modern business. It has been an evolution which has marched with such steady steps in the path of growing wealth, higher wages and industrial development that, to the intelligent observer of its progress, any assumption of its connection with the work of individual conspirators or of moneyed syndicates seems puerile. If there has lurked, in a few conservative minds, a fear that the labored arguments of the bimetallists regarding the scarcity of gold had some foundation, and that there really was a relation between low prices, the stagnation of business and the gradual subordination of silver to gold as a standard of value, this fear ought to have been dissipated and this relationship disproved by the present wonderful awakening of American industry.

The United States has been on the gold standard practically since 1834; not by virtue of any legislative enactment, but in obedience to an irresistible natural law which sends the less valuable of two metals out of circulation and makes the other the standard. At the date named, an attempt was made to maintain by legislation what all experience has proved to be impossible, a double standard; and it so happened that the mint value of silver was fixed at a lower figure than its commercial value. As a consequence, silver sought its market elsewhere than at the mints, and gold became the standard, and has so remained ever since. Upon that basis, all contracts have been made from that time to this. Even during the period of suspended specie payments business was transacted with relation to gold values.

When, in 1853, legislation was had reducing the amount of silver in the subsidiary coins, the declaration was expressly made by the committee which reported the bill to the House, that it was their intention "to make gold the standard coin." And so, in the much-abused act of 1873, it was provided that the gold dollar should be the unit of value. Notwithstanding the facts of history and of legislation, the existence of gold as our standard has failed to receive universal recognition, and the battle of the standards has still continued to be waged, as witness the Teller resolution in the Senate in the spring of 1898, which declared for the payment of the outstanding obligations of the United States in silver dollars, and for the legality and good faith of such payment; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as witness, also, the fact that the last Presidential election turned largely upon the doctrine of the Teller resolution. That resolution failed in the House by a vote of one hundred and eighty-two to one hundred and thirty-three, but it passed in the Senate by a vote of forty-seven to thirty-two, thus illustrating the uncertainty surrounding the interpretation of our present laws. Even now it is apparent that the advocates of the free coinage of silver are preparing to embark in another Presidential campaign upon their old platform.

There can be, of course, no question as to the maintenance of the gold standard so long as a sound-money President and Secretary of the Treasury are at the helm, and hence it has been argued in some quarters that no legislation upon the subject is necessary. But it must be remembered that, under present conditions, a Secretary of the Treasury unfriendly to the standard, or even one who hesitated bravely to use his powers under old laws, might by a single executive act, or by a neglect to act, suspend the gold standard in the United States. The report, in the spring of 1893, that Secretary Carlisle contemplated the redemption of the Treasury notes of 1890 in silver alone, is an illustration of the dangerous power to wreck the standard lodged in the executive department under existing law. Mr. Carlisle had an unquestioned legal right to pay silver only for the Treasury notes, except so far as he might feel governed by the purpose and spirit of American public policy in previous years in support of the gold standard. The descent of the country to the silver standard might be reached by merely passive neglect to replenish the gold reserve when exhausted by the redemption of legal tender notes. Something like this almost occurred in the autumn of 1893, when the cash balance in the Treasury, including the gold available for the redemption of notes, was allowed to fall below $100,000,000 and the issue of bonds to strengthen the Treasury was deferred until the beginning of 1894.

These incidents occurred under an administration devoted to the cause of sound money, and which eventually issued $262,000,000 in bonds to maintain the national credit. What might have happened under an administration avowedly opposed to the gold standard may be surmised, but its evils cannot be definitely measured. A silver Secretary of the Treasury might have declared that, under his view of sound public policy, he would exercise the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

option of redeeming public obligations in silver, and, even if he had paid gold while he had it, he might have folded his hands when the gold was exhausted and thereafter paid silver for the interest on the public debt, and for other public dues. Such an act would have terminated the parity of gold and other money in the United States, sent all our circulating money to a discount in gold, brought our bonded obligations pouring back upon the New York market, even more rapidly than they actually came in 1894 and 1895 under the mere suspicion of such a possibility, withdrawn thereby a large volume of capital employed in American industries, produced a series of panics and convulsions which would have destroyed our credit before the world, and set back the hands upon the dial of our industrial progress for a generation. It is against the possibility of such calamities that provision should be made, by writing it plainly in the law that the gold dollar is the standard unit of value of American currency, and that it will continue to be the standard until abolished by deliberate legislation.

But it is necessary that more than that should be done. There must be legislation compelling the fulfilment of the obligations of the United States in conformity with the standard. As it has been urged that there is no necessity for enacting the gold standard, so also it is said that there is no necessity for a law making our obligations payable in accordance therewith, because they always have been so paid. No administration in power has proposed to reverse this policy, but it by no means follows that no future administration shall so propose.

The Government obligations are of two kinds: bonded obligations with their interest, and obligations which circulate as money.

Interest on the public debt held at home and abroad has been paid in gold or its equivalent. This policy could not be changed without producing many of the evil consequences involved in a change of the standard. Since this is the settled policy of the United States in common with other responsible Governments, nothing can be lost by enacting it into law. On the contrary, much is likely to be gained, in actual saving of money, as well as in our heightened credit, by declaring specifically that gold is the money in which our public obligations are payable. It will be necessary in 1904 to convert $100,000,000 in outstanding five per cent. bonds, and in 1907 $559,652,650 in four per cent. bonds, except

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so far as some portion of these bonds may be redeemed and retired in the meantime. There is no doubt that this conversion can be made upon much more favorable terms for the Treasury, if all public obligations of the United States are specifically payable in gold coin of the present standard weight and fineness. The offer made by the bond syndicate to Mr. Cleveland to pay $539,159 per year more for $65,116,275 in four per cent. gold bonds, running for thirty years, than for bonds payable in coin, would have amounted to a saving for the entire term of the bonds of $16,-174,770. This offer illustrates the different point of view from which coin and gold bonds are regarded. A like saving upon the large volume of the four per cent. bonds which mature in 1907, upon a similar extension for thirty years, would result in a gain to the taxpayers of more than $130,000,000.

The reasons which favor making the bonded obligations of the Government payable specifically in gold apply with equal force to the payment of the obligations of the Government which circulate as money. Legal tender money issued by the State necessarily becomes the standard of value in exchanges. Nothing but specific contracts for the payment of another form of money can guard against the effects of changes in the legal tender money of the country, and such contracts are not practicable in the small transactions of daily life, including the payment of the wages of labor. The payment of bonds in depreciated money, injurious as it would be to the national credit, would be only an incident in the financial policy of a State which steadily maintained its circulating money upon the gold basis. In many senses, it is of much greater importance that the paper money of the United States should be redeemed in gold on demand and kept constantly at par with gold, than that the bonded obligations should be thus sustained. The depreciation of legal tender money means injustice to every creditor, the vitiation of nearly every private contract, and the introduction into arrangements for the payment of wages and into business transactions of elements of doubt and speculation which make legitimate commerce the prey of bullion agents and brokers in exchange. The members of this class, which has a legitimate but subordinate function in a solvent country, become in truth the kings of finance and the masters of the fortunes of the people, when the circulating medium is divorced from the free play of the foreign exchanges, by falling below parity with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gold in the world's markets. A country upon the gold standard has the gold of the world to draw upon for the defeat of any possible conspiracy for the cornering of money. A country upon a depreciated standard is shut off in a measure from the world's money supply, and compelled to pay for the use of the sole legal tender the prices which the exchange brokers push up and down, according to their opportunities of profit.

The two requisites therefore—that gold should be made the standard of value by law, and that public obligations, whether bonds or legal tender money, should be specifically payable in the standard or its equivalent—seem to be essential in a prosperous industrial country which proposes to compete upon equal terms for supremacy in the world's markets with other civilized nations. But more than mere declarations are necessary. Power must be vested in the proper officials to carry out these declarations in periods of stress. The President and the Secretary of the Treasury should be armed with every power necessary to execute the two declarations which affirm the standard and apply it to public obligations. Their powers under existing law are doubtful. Every President and Secretary of the Treasury heretofore has assumed the authority to raise means for the maintenance of the gold standard. But the authority should be clear and express, not the subject of assumption or construction. How widely diverse are the interpretations of existing law was shown, as we have seen, by the action of the Senate and House with respect to the Teller resolution.

Then, again, in order to remove all doubt regarding the purpose of the Government and its ability to maintain the gold standard against any contingency, the amount of the gold reserve should be fixed, the reserve should be separated from the fiscal service of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury should be directed to sell bonds upon an economical basis, or to issue short-term Treasury certificates whenever necessary to keep the gold reserve constantly at the point which would ensure the confidence of the business community. The maintenance of a proper reserve is one of the fundamental requirements of modern finance. Economy in the use of gold results in the settlement of many millions of dollars' worth of transactions, through the exchange of banking credits by the banks and clearing houses. These credits in the great civilized States which adhere to the gold standard

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have acquired nearly the same solidity as gold. But they depend for this solidity upon the belief that the great banks which issue and assume such obligations can find the gold for the settlement of balances, and for the execution of their great mass of contracts to deliver gold, on the occasions when the gold is demanded. The United States Treasury is without the power to attract gold from abroad by regulating the discount rate. It can inspire confidence in its paper issues only by keeping a visible reserve capable of meeting all probable demands. It is idle to say that the public credit will sustain the value of money which is not immediately redeemable. Experience has shown that this is not the case, because paper money is a contract to deliver coin on demand, and not a certificate for the delivery of value at some indefinite date. What the holder of paper money desires is not the redemption for value in the obscure future, but command over gold coin, the money of international exchanges, at the precise moment when he has the occasion to use the money. This can only be secured by a metallic stock which will meet all ordinary demands and provide a safe reserve against contingencies and unexpected disasters.

From what has been said, it logically follows that the Government should not discriminate among its monetary obligations. The United States is already pledged by the Act of 1893, which repealed the silver purchase clause of the Act of 1890, to "the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts." This parity can be effectively insured only by treating all public obligations alike as redeemable in standard money on demand. There has been hesitation in some quarters to place silver upon an equality with gold by providing for the free interchange of the two metals by the Government, because of the fear that the Treasury would add unduly to its present burdens, by the offer to exchange $482,122,376 in standard silver dollars for gold. At first blush, this seems a serious proposition. A moment's consideration will show, however, that it cannot add to the real burden on the Treasury.

A system of silver redemption as the equivalent of gold now prevails through the receipt of silver for public dues. In the absence of legislation changing the law in this respect, and thus discrediting silver, it is within the power of the citizen

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practically to secure gold redemption of his silver, while he at the same time robs the Treasury of its main supply of gold, which accrues from daily receipts thereof in customs and internal revenue taxes. The statistics of the customs receipts, covering a recent period of years, demonstrate the fact that, whenever discredit is thrown upon the silver or paper money of the country, protection is sought by the substitution of the latter for gold in payment of the public dues. Prior to 1890, the date of the passage of the Sherman law, customs dues were paid almost wholly in gold certificates. From that date down until 1897 payments were made in large part in United States notes, Treasury notes and silver. Thus, in December, 1893, the proportion of silver certificates paid reached fifty-one and one-tenth per cent., and did not fall below forty-five per cent. during any of the first eight months of 1894. It is fair to presume that the enactment of a law which would avoid any discrimination against silver would be the most effective method of protecting the Treasury against demands for its exchange for gold.

But assuming, for the sake of the argument, the exchangeability of silver for gold to be some menace to the Treasury, the possible danger would seem to be of insignificant proportions. Our stock of silver is scattered amongst seventy-five millions of people, throughout the whole vast area of our country. It constitutes the current money of exchange. It has to do with all the myriad small transactions of business life. It would be almost impossible to withdraw it from circulation in any substantial amount. That could only be done at all by paying a premium for it. It is beyond reasonable conception that any contingency can arise which would make its exchangeability with gold a serious menace to be provided against.

Nor, if we consider the statistics as to the silver held by banks, does there appear to be any likelihood of danger from that source. On February 4, 1899, for example, the amount of silver dollars and silver certificates held by banks amounted to $43,501,196, less than one-tenth of the whole stock. This was distributed among thirty-six hundred national banks. It constituted their small change. It was absolutely essential to the conduct of their daily business. Moreover, it was widely distributed over the whole country. New York held only $7,200,000; Chicago about $4,000,000; St. Louis less than $2,000,000. About $14,000,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was distributed throughout other reserve cities. The balance was held by country banks in the New England, Eastern Middle, Southern, Western and Pacific States. From any point of view, the offer to exchange silver for gold does not seem to promise any additional burden on the Treasury. An additional safeguard might be provided by the limitation of the issue of silver certificates to denominations of five dollars and less.

There are only two alternatives for the Government in regard to the silver dollars—to discriminate against them or to treat them in every respect as the equal of gold. Discrimination means that the coins would fall below par or be paid for public dues to the exclusion of all other forms of money. So long as the Government redeems silver dollars by any method, it does not essentially change the burden imposed upon the Treasury, whether this redemption is in the acceptance of the silver for public dues, or in the direct offer to receive silver in exchange for gold. If the Treasury elects to pursue the policy of accepting silver for public dues alone, it is merely left for the banks and the taxpayer to sort out their silver for the payment of customs and internal revenue taxes, and to retain their gold. Much more effective, in maintaining confidence and diminishing the burdens upon the Treasury, is the proposition to treat all issues of national money alike, by the offer to exchange one for another at all times without discrimination, and to maintain all at an equality with the standard of value. In such a case, the stream of gold entering the Treasury through the public dues will not be dried up, even if it is slightly attenuated in periods of commercial disaster, and the occasion for issuing bonds to maintain the reserve will be much less than under a policy of discrimination and timidity.

These, then, are the fundamental propositions of an intelligent beginning in the reform of our monetary system—the declaration that gold is the standard, the provision that public obligations are payable in the standard at the will of the holder, and the grant of the power to the executive officers of the Government to take all necessary and efficient steps to execute these pledges, until they are directed to do otherwise by the deliberate judgment of the people, expressed through the mandate of the law-making branch of the Government.

JOHN DALZELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED